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COMMENDING
WEST OAKLAND/CYPRESS ARCHAEOLOGY PROJECT

Whereas, the West Oakland/Cypress Archaeology Project has helped to preserve the history of 19th and 20th century West Oakland through archaeological investigations, an oral history program, vernacular architecture studies, and historical research; and

Whereas, the multi-cultural heritage of West Oakland has been brought to life through the West Oakland/Cypress Archaeology Project research into often ignored populations, including Chinese-Americans, African-Americans, and immigrant and working class populations; and

Whereas, the results of this important work have been made available to West Oakland residents in video, CD, print, on the World Wide Web and in public displays through partnerships with the University of California, Berkeley and the African American Museum and Library at Oakland; and

Whereas, "Putting the 'There' There: Historical Archaeologies of West Oakland", the West Oakland/Cypress Archaeology Project interpretive report and World Wide Web site, has received international recognition; now

Therefore, be it proclaimed on the 10th Day of July 2004, Councilmember Nancy J. Nadel on behalf of the City of Oakland commends Sonoma State University and the California Department of Transportation for their outstanding achievements in the preservation of West Oakland archaeology and the dissemination of its history.

Nancy J. Nadel
Oakland City Councilmember
District 3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The I-880 Cypress Freeway Replacement, a project of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 4, involved the reconstruction of a 3.1-mile section of freeway in Oakland and Emeryville, California. As part of its plan to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, Caltrans contracted with the Anthropological Studies Center at Sonoma State University (ASC) to examine the area of potential effects (APE). An archaeological sensitivity study reduced the portion of the APE that was likely to contain important remains from 48 to a relatively manageable 22 blocks, while the project research design worked to define the characteristics of potential historic properties.

Between 1994 and 1996, archaeologists tested the 22 archaeologically sensitive city blocks that would be affected by construction. Nearly 2,600 archaeological features were discovered, including 121 significant ones containing more than 400,000 artifacts and ecofacts dating between the 1850s and 1910. Because of the enormous quantity of data, two separate reports were planned on the investigations: the Block Technical Report (BTR) series—including on a compact disc at the back of this volume—and this, the interpretive report. The goal of the BTRs is to allow archaeologists easy access to all the Cypress data on features determined eligible to the National Register of Historic Places, while this report interprets these data.

The Cypress Archaeology Project database is unprecedented in the West. Over 120 discrete artifact assemblages were recovered and associated with specific households. A wide variety of groups is represented, from unskilled working-class households to upper-middle-class families, immigrants from numerous countries, and native-born whites and African Americans. Each BTR is organized by project block and archaeological feature. Complete historical associations are provided for every discrete archaeological assemblage, as are narrative and tabular descriptions of the remains, presented in a standardized format.

The purpose of this volume—the interpretive report—is to use some of the data contained in the BTRs to address themes identified in the project research design. Table 1.4 connects research questions posed in the research design (Praetzelis 1994) with resulting discussions included in this volume. The method has been collaborative, involving professionals in archaeology, history, folklore, oral history, and vernacular architecture. The use of a plain-English style and frequent illustrative sidebars and graphics is intended to make the volume appeal to a variety of readers, from professionals to interested community members. Each main essay, short essay, and sidebar is a stand-alone piece; while certain themes run through this report, it can be read in any order. An easily viewed portable document format (popularly known as PDF) version is posted at www.sonoma.edu/asc.

Part I presents the how, why, where, and who of the Cypress Archaeology Project, along with a brief narrative history of West Oakland. Part II contains chapters on the material conditions of life in West Oakland, the politics of the Victorian parlor, and household adaptive strategies. Part III focuses on the people of the neighborhood, with essays on the archaeology of gender; the material culture of the “aristocracy of labor”; the Overseas Chinese and laundry work; the archaeology and landscape of lodging; and a chapter devoted to the archaeology and near 150-year history of African Americans in West Oakland.

The final chapter contrasts the largely negative presentation of West Oakland by historical commentators with a view based on historical archaeology and makes some recommendations
for future work on archaeology projects. Appendixes include a project timeline; a list of other scholarly and interpretive products that have been created from Cypress Project data; a record of the historical associations of each archaeological feature; summaries and artifact layout photographs of 69 of the features studied; a much-edited version of the Field Director’s diary; and statistical studies of faunal and glass remains. An attached compact disk contains the artifact catalog, revised faunal tables and faunal analysis methods, and the Block Technical Reports, of which the Cypress Archaeology Project team is particularly proud.
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CHAPTER 1

THE LOMA PRIETA EARTHQUAKE
AND ITS AFTERMATH

ADRIAN PRAETZELLIS AND MARY PRAETZELLIS

5:04 P.M., 17 OCTOBER 1989

Just as the San Francisco Giants and the Oakland A’s were taking the field to play the third game of the 1989 World Series, a 6.9 magnitude earthquake shook the San Francisco Bay Area. The quake destroyed a 1.25-mile section of the double-decker Cypress Freeway that funneled traffic through West Oakland to the Bay Bridge, sandwiching vehicles and their passengers between the collapsed roadways (Figure 1.1). Residents of the neighborhood were the first on the scene. With ropes and ladders they searched the debris and lowered survivors to safety, defying the very real possibility that they might be trapped themselves by an aftershock. Later, working with neighborhood activists, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) announced that it would rebuild the freeway on a different alignment to mend the split neighborhood that had been created by the original construction in the 1950s. Approval of the new route planted the seed of the Cypress Archaeological Project.

This is how archaeologists from Sonoma State University and Caltrans came to study 48 city blocks in advance of freeway construction between 1992 and 1998. They found more than 2,500 historic-era archaeological features, of which 121 (comprising 98 feature complexes) were determined eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The resulting half-million artifacts were analyzed, and the findings summarized in a recently published series of Block Technical Reports (BTRs) (Praetzellis 2001). The excavation at the sole prehistoric Native American site discovered in 1998 during project-related activities—CA-ALA-17—is reported elsewhere (Jones n.d.). The present volume is the penultimate in a series that will document the results of the Cypress Archaeological Project. While the BTRs were intended to provide contextualized data for future use by archaeologists and historians, this volume tackles important research issues and begins the process of putting the data to work as part of Caltrans’s mandate to ensure that “the results of archaeological documentation are reported and made available to the public” (48 CFR 44734).

Figure 1.1. A stretch of the Cypress Freeway after the devastating Loma Prieta Earthquake, 17 October 1989. (Source: H.G. Wilshire, U.S. Geological Survey)
The Construction Project: Where and What

Officially known as the I-880 Cypress Replacement Project, the project area is located in West Oakland and Emeryville, California, near the east shore of San Francisco Bay (Figure 1.2). The construction project’s main purpose was to restore capacity to the interstate and regional highway network, which was lost when the earthquake destroyed the link between 18th and 34th streets in Oakland. The new freeway alignment begins near Martin Luther King Way (formerly Grove Street) and Seventh Street and travels westward to Bay Street (curving around the rear of the post office at Wood Street) and then northward along the east edge of the Oakland Army Base to West Grand Avenue (Figure 1.3). The link was opened for traffic on 30 September 1998 at a cost of $1 billion, making it the most expensive highway project in California history (Fernandez 1998).

The project area lies on the western margin of an alluvial plain that slopes west from the Berkeley hills. The plain has been extended by the placement of fill on marshland and in some shallow water areas. The ground surface elevation ranges from about 20 feet above mean sea level (amsl) near the I-580/I-980 Interchange to less than 10 feet amsl on much of the filled land. Thus, on city blocks between Martin Luther King Way southwest to just beyond Center Street, substantial footings had to be built to support the new freeway columns and the elevated structure; the footings were placed on deeply driven piles as large as 27 feet square. This situation, combined with proposed construction trenches often leaving little or no undisturbed soil around the lines of footings, triggered a series of legally mandated studies, as Caltrans officials recognized the potential destructive effect of the project on important archaeological remains from one of Oakland’s most historic neighborhoods.

The Legal Context

The use of federal funds and permits on the Cypress Replacement Project triggered the implementation of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. This law requires, among other things, that the responsible federal agency “take into account” the effects of its undertakings on archaeological sites that are or may be eligible to the NRHP. The area of potential effects (APE) was set by the lead federal agency, in this case the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and an archaeological sensitivity study was conducted to identify areas within the APE that were likely to contain historic-period resources. An area of historic archaeological interest was delineated between Martin Luther King Way, Fifth, and Sixth streets and roughly the intersection of Chase and Cedar streets (Mc Ilroy 1993). North of this point, the alignment
immediately overlay landfill and was determined to have a low sensitivity for historic archaeological remains. Additional blocks within the area defined as sensitive were eliminated from study because they either lacked 19th-century construction, contained industries that would have produced contaminated soils, or would not be affected by construction. Research designs and treatment plans were prepared for Caltrans to address prehistoric and historical archaeology (Pape 1995; Praetzellis 1994; White 1995).

Archaeologists undertook a modified approach to Section 106 compliance because of the extreme time constraints of the construction schedule. The standard process treats potentially important sites in distinct stages: identification, evaluation, and data recovery. For the Cypress Project, these phases were collapsed into a single operation by applying the detailed research design and treatment plan during a combined identification/evaluation stage. Archaeologists evaluated the NRHP-eligibility potential of archaeological features as they were uncovered. Features that did not meet the criteria presented in the research design were abandoned as NRHP-ineligible. Conversely, each deposit that exhibited the specified characteristics was treated as potentially eligible, and excavated.
THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH DESIGN

But what, might one ask, did it tell us about the past that we didn’t know before? This frames the question wrongly. The issue is not what new facts were revealed but what new emphases were stressed.

—Carmel Schrire, Digging through Darkness [1995:111].

A Contextual Approach

Contextual archaeology emphasizes the specific historical, social, and cultural context of behavior rather than the supposed universal influences sought by the practitioners of processual archaeology (Figure 1.4). This approach parallels the trend in the social sciences in general toward problems of “contextuality, the meaning of social life to those who enact it, and the explanation of exception and indeterminants rather than the regularities in phenomena observed” (Marcus and Fischer 1986:8). Structuralism, symbolism, critical theory, and “meaning” (Leone 1986) are stressed in interpretation. Contextualists also recognize the active role of both material culture and the archaeologist in the creation of the past.

An important element of the contextual approach is that the research issues it emphasizes are not as amenable to hypotheses testing as those of processual archaeology. Many archaeologists have found the processualist hypothetico-deductive model useful in achieving methodological rigor. Others, however, feel that the approach has solidified into a new canon that does not tolerate alternative ways of knowing; those bold enough to transgress these “laws of [positivist] discourse” may find that “the epistemological... police are waiting” (Shanks and Tilley 1992:23). Historians of science have been insisting for some time that rigor in archaeology does not require an exclusively hypothetico-deductive approach (Feyerabend 1988; Wylie 1992). Most notably, the insistence that archaeological data are important to the degree that they help scholars “answer questions” about the past is based on a naive and misleading model of historical archaeology as a set of techniques for discovering specific facts—missing tidbits of information—that can “fill in data gaps.” While the analogy functions well when applied to the construction of chronologies, it reveals a naiveté about the process of historiography and potential contribution of historical archaeology under other paradigms.
James Deetz characterizes the nature of research in archaeology as follows:

In the nonexperimental sciences (if archaeology is indeed a science), precise certainty is rarely achieved. Rather, research takes the form of a gradual refinement of explanation, as more and more factors are incorporated into the construction of the past that one is attempting to create. In historical archaeology, this refinement is best accomplished by maintaining a balance between the documentary and the material evidence, being always mindful that, to be a productive exercise, the results should provide a more satisfactory explanation than would be forthcoming from either set of data alone [1988:367].

For the historical archaeologist and the social historian alike, questions serve to guide research, not to constrain it. They are not answered in the conventional meaning of the word, for “there is no final and definitive account of the past as it was” (Shanks and Hodder 1998:70). Archaeologists have themselves taken up the banner, finding it desirable to “seek alternative models of science that resolve the problems of positivism” while retaining “general scientific goals” (Whitley 1998:24). Contextual or interpretive archaeology is such an approach.

The differences between processual and post-processual models reflect quite dissimilar conceptualization of the meaning of artifacts. While processual archaeologists strive for predictability, post-processualists insist that this is a vain search—that the meaning of artifacts is dependent on the context of their use (Hodder 1986; for several California examples, see Praetzellis and Praetzellis 2001).

While processual archaeologies are concerned with development of general principles in relation to grand explanatory models, seeing individual cases as means to an end, post-processualists often work in very different territory: they examine at the smallest of scales, the (re)constructed experiences of families and even individuals within those elements of contemporary social life to which the researchers feels they have access. The Cypress research approach is based on something that historical archaeologists have known for years: some of our most effective work is done at the small scale, emphasizing the commonplace and bringing the lives of the disenfranchised into focus.

Furthermore, it is this very characteristic of the data—their placement in the realm of the small-scale, mundane, and personal—that puts us in a position to avoid a curious irony inherent in overreaching global interpretive models: through their insistence on finding coherence and pattern in human history, the large-scale normative analyses of processual archaeologists effectively mask and homogenize the diversity of human experience in the past (Johnson 1999:34). Historical archaeology, however, has access to “a space between often very powerful master narratives of cultural and social identity and much smaller, stranger and potentially subversive narratives of archaeological material” (Johnson 1999:34).

**Research Issues**

The Cypress Archaeological Project research design focused on three principal issues: modernization, Victorianism, and working-class culture.

While the great exhibitions of the 19th century were displaying the newly available products of the industrial revolution, the very process of industrialization was transforming Western society and culture. In 19th-century America, this process involved a change from a traditional, “face-to-face” society (Redfield 1955) to one that emphasized rationality in economic relationships,
specialization, and efficiency, and in which attainment of the goal of an improved future was to be measured by material progress (Brown 1976:29; Wallerstein 1983). Bender (1978) proposed that the modernization of 19th-century American urban dwellers was multilinear and complex: multilinear because various class and ethnic groups participated to varying degrees; and complex since individuals and families were simultaneously involved with both traditional and modern ways of life. Through the mechanism of family and social networks, national, religious, and ethnic ties remained strong and encouraged communal, traditional values and practices (Bender 1978:122; Haraven 1978). At the same time, industrial time discipline, the cash economy, and relationships with government institutions necessitated that individuals be able to function within the modern order (Rodgers 1978).

It has been suggested that a set of cultural values, practices, and aesthetics known as “Victorianism” (Howe 1976; Wiebe 1967) or “gentility” (Lawrence 2000) came to predominate among the Euroamerican cultural and political establishment of this modern society. Victorianism is said to have been a “homogenizing force” (Hardesty 1980) upon the cultures of immigrants and the native-born working class alike, which attempted to replace traditional mores with modern values and patterns of behavior suited to their roles in an industrial society. Archaeological research is in a unique position to assess both the relative pervasiveness of Victorianism as well as the degree of resistance to the values of the emerging industrial society in the form of the development of a distinctive working class and other cultures. This is because these archaeological remains are the material outcomes of household-level decision-making that was conditioned by powerful social and cultural forces. By theorizing the relationship between material culture and these mores, we can have access to the process of cultural change as it operated at levels from individual families to entire ethnic populations, and even to social units whose characteristics we have yet to define.

West Oakland was the home of many working-class immigrants. Thus its history and archaeology are a particularly suitable venue in which to examine an issue of great importance to social historians: the process by which people from traditional, pre-modern cultures—both immigrant and native-born—adapted to life in an industrial society (Gutman 1977).

**Research Themes and Questions**

From these historical issues and approaches, the archaeologists constructed research themes as well as several research questions associated with each theme. Each of the themes and its principal research question are presented in Table 1.1, below. The interested reader is referred to the research design (Praetzellis 1994) or any BTR on the attached CD for the complete list.

These questions, as well as their associated data requirements, were constructed to help evaluate the importance of each archaeological deposit as it was encountered in the field. It is important to note that questions generated in this way and for this purpose may not have definitive “answers” since the contextual approach stresses gaining general insights into important historical issues rather than providing “answers” to “questions.” The struggles between labor and capital, and modernism and traditional culture, were played out on the streets of West Oakland and in its homes, lodgings, shops, and public houses. The method of historical archaeology is to weave together the data from the ground, from the archives, from maps and photographs, and from oral history consultants around the material remains left by the participants in this process. In this way, we aim to create a richer, more human history of West Oakland and the people who once lived there.
Table 1.1. Cypress Archaeology Project Research Themes and Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Principal Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Behavior and Strategies</td>
<td>Does this resource enable us to describe the consumer practices and disposal behavior of a household or business with specific social, occupational, economic, and/or ethnic characteristics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity and Urban Subcultures</td>
<td>Does this resource reflect the rise or relative influence of Victorianism as a class-based ideology?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrialization and Technology</td>
<td>Does this resource contain evidence of undocumented or poorly documented industrial processes that could add significantly to our knowledge of the development of a specific industry?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Geography</td>
<td>Does this resource help us to understand the characteristics of the natural environment and the landscape modifications made during the historic period?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Waste Disposal</td>
<td>Can this refuse dump aid in our understanding of neighborhood or citywide consumption and disposal patterns?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Potential(^1)</td>
<td>Does the resource have public interpretive potential?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)This theme did not contribute to the NRHP eligibility of Cypress resources. It was included in the project research design to ensure that this value was not forgotten.

METHODS

IN THE FIELD

The project research design emphasized the use of data derived from caches of artifacts that could be associated with historically documented households. Since these collections could most often be found in hollow filled features, such as refuse pits and disused privies and wells, the initial task was to find these features. To this end, and before any test excavation was begun, surveyors laid out the 19th-century parcel lines—for privies and other hollow features were commonly placed along the rear of domestic lots. Although the archaeological testing phase emphasized areas to be affected by construction, the central portion of each block often received the most attention, as it was the most sensitive for the desired type of remains. A health and safety plan was also developed before fieldwork began. The plan described precautions to be taken to avoid exposure to contaminated soils and other potentially dangerous conditions.

The archaeological deposits were found to be covered by varying depths of fill soil, which was scraped away by a hydraulic backhoe/loader with a 36-inch, flat-edged bucket (Figure 1.5). The object was to expose previous ground surfaces (interfaces) in plan view so that the tops of features were exposed in the trench floor, not in its sides. As cultural features and stratification were identified, they were further exposed in plan by hand, photographed, and mapped in relation to a permanent datum.

The content and integrity of each feature was assessed by excavating a portion of it by hand. In the case of refuse-filled pits, for example, each feature was cross-sectioned. All excavation
was done in a strictly stratigraphic manner, that is, according to the physical layers of deposition, and the strata used as the primary provenience for artifacts contained in them. Excavated soil was passed through 1/8- or 1/4-inch screen, as appropriate, to document all classes of artifacts. As a general rule, a minimum amount of excavation was performed to allow the Principal Investigator, Field Director, and Caltrans archaeologist to jointly evaluate the feature’s research potential by applying the “AIMS-R” principles delineated in the treatment plan. The extensive pre-field historical research allowed most decisions to be made in the field regarding the research potential of each feature by associating archaeological deposits with specific households and businesses. Historians conducted additional research on remains that could not be associated with the households, industries, and businesses on the basis of information collected during the archival research phase. Features that were determined to be nonsignificant were abandoned and, in most cases, the artifacts were returned to the hole from which they were excavated. Some materials were retained as teaching collections and distributed to various Bay Area educational institutions.

When the identification phase was completed for each block and the features evaluated for eligibility to the NRHP, the results were reported to the reviewing agencies—FHWA and the State Historic Preservation Office—in a letter report. Site trinomials were then obtained from the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System.

In the Lab

In historical archaeology, the “site” is often an artificial construct that consists of the totality of archaeological remains in a circumscribed location, regardless of their period of deposition or historical association. Defined in this way, the site is meaningless as an analytical unit. The products of each excavation site (in this case, the city block) were geared toward the interpretation of individual proveniences or a number of proveniences that had demonstrable historical associations. Hence, there were numerous analytical units within each “site” and even within each building lot.

Initially, artifacts were cataloged according to archaeological provenience and material. Although specialists divided materials into appropriate categories for presentation in their analyses, the catalog of historic-period artifacts was reorganized for interpretation and synthesis according to functional categories: activities, domestic, indefinite, industrial, personal, storage, structural, and unidentified use. After analysis, artifacts were stored according to material and provenience at the Archaeological Collections Facility at Sonoma State University, where they are available for future research.
WHAT OUR "AIMS-R"

The Cypress Project's condensed approach to Section 106 compliance required that archaeologists in the field decide which remains should be excavated and analyzed, and which should not. This was a heavy responsibility. Archaeological remains, it was reasoned, have the characteristics of historical association, integrity, materials, stratigraphy, and rarity. This observation led to the development of a set of general principles to guide the decision-making process:

| **Association** | ...the research potential of an archaeological deposit that has reliable and precise historical or chronological associations will be higher than one whose associations are less certain. |
| **Integrity**   | ...a feature that retains good integrity will have more research potential than one whose integrity has been compromised. |
| **Materials**   | ...the research potential of a cache of materials from a domestic context will increase with the number of items and the variety of types present. |
| **Stratigraphy** | ...remains that meet the other criteria and have vertically or horizontally discrete stratification retain importance. Remains from a feature with a complex stratigraphic sequence representative of different events over time may provide a chronological check on artifact diagnosis and the interpretation of the sequence of environmental or historical events. |
| **Relative rarity** | ...remains from a group that is poorly represented in the sample universe will be more important, because of their rarity, than remains that relate to a well-represented entity. |

From the initial letter of each of these principles, we derived the mnemonic **AIMS-R**.

Oral History

The oral-history program was an essential research component. The “ghosts” of several 19th- and early-20th-century ethnic communities were successfully fleshed out through oral history and ethnographic fieldwork. Cultural and ethnic traditions are often expressed ephemerally and may leave little or no material trace. Thus, the questions asked by the project oral historians complemented and expanded the data recorded in the archaeological record: What did Irish railroad families eat at countless meals? Did they continue to step dance, play Irish music, and attend *ceilidhes*? Did the local Azorean-Portuguese community express identity through the public

Figure 1.6. The Chin family of West Oakland, ca. 1920. Oral history brings out the personal side of history. This picture of the family was provided by oral-history informant Florence [Chin] Wong.
performance of the Holy Ghost Festa? Did Slovenians and Italians meet for bocci ball matches or even baseball games? Was West Oakland indeed a “melting pot” prior to World War II?

Interviews were conducted with more than 40 individuals representing a variety of ethnicities and occupations, from Greek to Chinese and from Redcap porters to physicians (Figure 1.6). Some relevant taped interviews on file at the Oakland History Room were transcribed as part of the project. Together these interviews cover first-hand observations on community events and family histories dating back to before the turn of the 19th century.

**HISTORY**

Research with historical records and accounts, as well as the writings of historians, contributed to two crucial areas of the Cypress Archaeology Project:

- identifying the households whose artifacts were found, as well as reconstructing their demographic and social characteristics; and
- developing the context in which these families lived by providing both general perspective and local focus to the research themes that guided this work.

Project historians and historical researchers examined primary sources—such as the U.S. Census population schedules, water-tap records, tax rolls, real-estate records, and photographs—at City and County offices, as well as the Oakland History Room and the African American Museum and Library at Oakland. Some obscure sources, such as correspondence of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, had to be ordered from outside California. Much of this information has been assembled into the detailed Documentary Research Tables associated with each excavated archaeological collection (see BTRs on attached CD).

Historians have been writing about Oakland since its inception. These secondary, interpretive sources range from commercially sponsored 19th-century history/biographies, such as Wood’s 1883 History of Alameda County, to the work of Self (2003), who sought to reexamine the view of Oakland as a slum. This and works such as Groth’s (1994) history of residential hotels made great contributions to our understanding of life in historic Oakland. The issues raised by historians, as well as by historical archaeologists, guided the development of the volume’s overall problem orientation.

**REPORTING WHAT WE FOUND**

With thousands of discrete features and hundreds of thousands of artifacts, the problem arose of how to present this massive quantity of data and our interpretations of it. The conventional model was considered first. This would have involved the creation of a single technical report containing long, detailed narrative descriptions of the history and archaeology of the various project sites, followed by the reports of various specialists in ceramics, food bone, glassware, and so on. The resulting vision was of a multi-volume set of telephone-directory-sized tomes. It was rejected. Instead the project team designed a staged series of reports, each with its own goal and audience (Figure 1.7).

First were the Block Technical Reports (BTRs). The goal of these reports was to present the massive quantity of data in a standardized format that would be easy for other archaeologists to
use. Behind the BTR concept was the principle that the artifacts were important for their context. Each BTR was organized by analytical unit (a feature or group of features), giving the history of the household that created it, as well as standardized tabulations of the content, and depiction and analysis of its structure. Thus, a researcher looking to study working-class African American families from the 1880s can easily locate suitable candidates in the BTRs. Furthermore, sufficient primary data are presented so that the scholar can re-assess our dating of the features and their associations. A limited number of paper copies of the 2,677-page BTRs were distributed to libraries and academic institutions. An additional 400 copies of the BTRs on compact disk were sent out at very low cost to institutions and individuals throughout North America and to archaeologists as far away as New Zealand, who are already using the information for comparisons with their own data.

Between the start of prefield research in 1992 and the completion of the BTRs in 2001, numerous additional products were created including museum exhibits, traveling displays, an interpretive monograph, and an educational video. “Holding the Fort: African American Historical Archaeology and Labor History in West Oakland” was a joint product of Caltrans, Sonoma State University, and the African American Museum and Library at Oakland (AAMLO) (Figure 1.8). This traveling display, which focused on the history and archaeology of African Americans in West Oakland, was installed at 14 public venues from Oakland City Hall to the State Railroad Museum in Sacramento to the National Civil Rights Conference in Scottsdale, Arizona, before being presented to AAMLO. A smaller exhibit on the project itself and the process of archaeological investigations made its way to numerous county fairs and celebrations such as Earth Day. A
DIRECTOR’S CUT: THE VIEW FROM THE SITE
Jack Mc Ilroy, Cypress Archaeology Project Field Director

Seventh Street West Oakland –
A Road through Ruins

If you took the seven-minute BART (Bay Area Rapid Transit) ride today from downtown San Francisco to West Oakland, you would find that the excavation area occupies about three-quarters of a mile on either side of the West Oakland BART station, almost in the shadow of the elevated BART tracks.

For the first 28 weeks, we were able to work well in advance of construction on selected blocks. Afterwards, the crew were often excavating just ahead of heavy equipment, in some cases with constant pile-driving taking place within 100 meters. This was not the best working environment and safety was a constant concern. The training of supervisory staff in CAL/OSHA’s 40-hour health and safety course for hazardous-waste workers, strict adherence to a site-safety plan, and frequent safety meetings saw the project completed free of major incidents.

Caltrans was concerned that the archaeologists did not delay the construction project. Delays would mean that contractors, forced onto down time, could charge the agency many thousands of dollars in liquidated damages. In the event, this never occurred. Construction priorities could change rapidly as the project advanced, and there was often uncertainty as to which block would be tackled next. Schedules were frequently altered and one lesson learned early on was the need for constant up-to-the-minute communication and flexibility.

Site Work

Our initial tools of choice were far from delicate. Each block was surface-scrapped by heavy machinery to expose the remains of the historic ground surface. It was often very disturbed. Two types of machinery were favored: a Gradall that could move dirt fast but had mobility limitations, and a 710 John Deere backhoe with an extending boom, and a 3-foot bucket with a flat cutting edge. The skill of the backhoe operator was crucial in reducing the archaeologists’ workload. A cutting edge instead of digging teeth resulted in a smooth scraped surface requiring less effort to clean. Features showed up well in contrast to the underlying yellow Merritt sand. The exception was in areas closer to the former marshy edges of the bay, where underlying sand tended to be dark gray to black. Generally 2 to 3 feet of overburden had to be removed, but in some cases closer to the bay, up to 5 feet of material had to be excavated to expose the remains.

As soon as a lot was cleared, the historic parcel lines were laid out based on the 1889 Sanborn map and then compared with surviving fence posts, of which there were usually many. While lots can change size and merge or be subdivided, there were usually enough original posts surviving to establish the 1889 lot boundaries with considerable accuracy. Correlation was good, except on Block 2, where there was a discrepancy of up to 3 feet; this was eventually resolved with further research. With most privies being close to rear lot lines, it was essential to identify lot boundaries accurately on the ground so that correct resident associations could be assigned. Caltrans surveyors plotted in the corners of the...
1889 Sanborn lots on the ground prior to our beginning excavation; correlation with excavated fence posts showed they were usually able to set the corners within 6 inches of their original positions.

The primary historical resource types found and targeted were hollow/filled features: pits, privies, and wells. Deposits of sheet refuse were rare, possibly a result of the demolition and construction processes to which these blocks were subjected. Their integrity of association was also questionable. During demolition, heavy equipment can significantly alter sheet refuse and mix deposits; where lots are only 25 feet wide, it is easy for materials to be spread over several parcels, making association difficult. Pits, privies, and wells, however, are immobile. These resources were specifically targeted in the research design and in the field because their materials enable the archaeologists to address the research questions. In short, they give the most bang for the buck.

Color-coded flagging tape was used to identify features on the ground. Features that displayed older artifacts in their surface fills, that were undisturbed, and that were on lots with excellent associations were targeted for excavation first. Occasionally, as a control, a feature that did not look promising or that was on a lot with poorer association would also be excavated. Some features considered NRHP-ineligible after excavation of a half section were also fully excavated in case an abundance of materials clustered in an unexcavated corner. This was rarely the case and it did not affect any final determination of NRHP eligibility. Our initial project schedule called for two people to spend three days excavating an average privy—about 4 feet long by 3 feet wide, and between 3 to 4 feet deep. By the end of the project, this rate had been cut in half.

After all potentially significant features in the vicinity of a well were excavated, wells were pedestaled. The process involved a backhoe opening a wide trench 5 feet deep around the well, leaving the brickwork standing like a chimney. The well could then be cross-sectioned and excavated from the outside. This process was repeated until the bottom of the well was reached. With some wells extending 15 feet below ground, there was at times a 30-foot wide hole on the surface. While more expensive in terms of machinery costs, this process is safe and efficient. The well could be excavated rapidly and the stratigraphic units accurately defined. Excavating wells from the inside is also more difficult due to the confined space.

After seven years of drought, the project ran through one of California’s wettest winters. At times features had to be continually bailed out and trenches dug to divert rainwater. Light, portable rain shelters enabled work to proceed under these conditions.

It was also important to keep up with and improve the copious paperwork. The basic site recording system, the context sheet, was revised on two occasions. Field crew, who operated at the interface between research design and archaeological practice, were encouraged to offer suggestions on how to increase efficiency on all aspects of the recording system and excavation.

What We Found

This is what we found: of the 2,580 archaeological features uncovered, there were 2,375 pits, 27 wells, and 178 privies; 765 features were excavated. Approximately 3 percent of the pits, 44 percent of the privies, and 44 percent of the wells—150 features in all—appeared NRHP-eligible in the field. This number was reduced to 121 following analysis back at the ASC lab. The primary reason for ineligibility was an insufficient quantity of artifacts within the excavated feature. Those planning future inner-urban excavations will want to note these figures: based on the 240 Cypress lots, 9.9 pits, 0.74 privies and 0.1 wells were found per lot. Archaeological preservation tended to be best on asphalt parking lots that had been paved over in the 1960s.

The project demonstrated the survival of extensive archaeological materials on city blocks impacted by heavy construction. Pits, privies, and wells were often found close to the columns supporting elevated freeway lanes. Thus, it cannot be assumed that freeway construction inevitably destroys all archaeological features.

The importance of providing security on blocks immediately as they became available was highlighted on Block 1. The week before the archaeologists started work, bottle hunters used a power auger to drill over 330 holes through the asphalt covering the block in an attempt to locate bottle-rich privies. They found two and then dug 17 huge pits looking for others. The bottle hunters had access to the same historic plans as archaeologists; but since their measurements were
off by several feet, they missed most of the archaeological features. Despite the block being looted and disturbed by 28 columns supporting an elevated freeway, the area along the rear fence line remained relatively intact and archaeological preservation on Block 1 was among the best on the project.

While the standard three-phased approach to Section 106 compliance can put archaeologists in the position of delaying major development projects, condensing identification, evaluation, and data-recovery phases into a single operation proved successful: we feel that it set a benchmark for future urban projects. When the technical archaeological parameters and decision-making processes are explicitly set out before work begins, the project proponent, archaeologist, construction contractor, and most of all the archaeological resources all benefit from a consolidated approach. Using this approach, the average time spent on each 360 x 200 ft. city block was 18 working days.

A phased discard policy was operated on the Cypress Project, as specified in the research design. Almost all structural material was discarded on site. In spite of this, we still had nearly 120,000 artifacts to deal with from important features that were curated at the Archaeological Collections Facility, Sonoma State University.

Appendix E takes you on a stroll through some of the highlights and low points of the project. It is compiled from the daily site log and is intended to convey an impression of what it was like to actually be on site during the excavation.

Interpretation

The contents of archaeological sites, be they pits, privies, wells, structures, strata, or artifacts, cannot speak for themselves. Archaeologists are required to interpret their findings. It is at this point that the data uncovered can be too easily subject to over-interpretation with only the most tenuous links existing between the two. There should be a clear and demonstrable link between data and conclusion. Like excavation skills, interpretive skills can take many years to develop. In interpreting the lives of long-dead citizens from their archaeological remains it is important to be aware that if material facts on the ground do not speak for themselves, our interpretations of those facts may do so even less. Conscientious archaeologists can take their cue from Sigmund Freud, and it is to be hoped we did so.

In face of the incompleteness of my analytic results, I had no choice but to follow the example of those discoverers whose good fortune it is to bring to the light of day after their long burial the priceless though mutilated relics of antiquity. I have restored what is missing, taking the best models known to me from other analyses; but, like a conscientious archaeologist, I have not omitted to mention in each case where the authentic parts end and my constructions begin [Bowdler 1996, citing Freud 1905, 8:41].

Archaeologist Gordon Childe, the unofficial father of European prehistory, may have summed things up even more concisely: “Archaeological data do not consciously misinform” (Kohl 1989:244). That is worth remembering when one reads any archaeological report.

Gertrude Stein said of Oakland that “There is no there, there,” by which she meant the place had so changed that she couldn’t find her childhood home. The famous quote, however, has been misinterpreted by Oakland’s detractors to brand the city as a place with no soul, no center, and where little of consequence happened.

We disagree—we were there.
third photo exhibit showing the historical archaeologists at work and displaying the tools they use, also made its way around northern California. Lastly, an exhibit titled “Barber Poles and Mugs: Black Barbering and Barbers in West Oakland” greeted visitors to the Oakland History Room at the main library for two months in 1997.

The first Cypress Project Interpretive Report is the 345-page *Sights and Sounds: Essays in Celebration of West Oakland*, a compendium of illustrated essays on topics ranging from African American unionism to 19th-century vernacular architecture to jazz and prostitution (Stewart and Praetzellis 1997). Although this research was done to support the archaeological studies, it is important in its own right for the perspective it gives to the vibrant history and culture of West Oakland.

On 20 July 1999 Caltrans held a successful public screening of “Privy to the Past: Historical Archaeology in West Oakland California,” an educational video on historical archaeology made on the Cypress Project. Suitable for high-school students and above, the video covers archaeology, local history, ethnic groups, and Cultural Resources Management (CRM). This short documentary provides an introduction to the field of historical archaeology—the study of the recent past using the familiar artifacts that people left behind. It included teaching notes and was widely distributed.

The final product of the Cypress Archaeology Project is still in the planning stage at the time of this writing. While the BTRs and, to a large extent, the present volume are directed toward a professional audience, the goal of the “public interpretive volume” will be to present some of the project’s findings in an informal style and a format that will allow for easy reproduction. The working title of this booklet is “Historical Archaeologies of Jack London’s Boyhood Haunts.” It will draw on the many connections between the writings of Jack London and the archaeological findings.

**Report Goals**

This report is not intended to present the raw archaeological facts or the technically analyzed data. Rather, this is where we present the insights afforded us by the combination of archaeological remains and historical research into this place and time. Our presentation is organized into a series of essays that address some of the themes that structured life in industrializing America. Our premise is that material culture in all its forms both reflects and had a continuing influence on the lives of West Oaklanders. Thus the essays do not privilege written records, oral accounts, extant vernacular architecture, or archaeology. All are used freely in the pursuit of our goal.
We have intentionally made the content of this volume eclectic and its format visually diverse. Individual authors were given the freedom to take their interpretations in directions that they felt appropriate. Some studies rely heavily on quantitative, statistical data; others are qualitative, taking a symbolic approach. On occasion, authors approach the boundary of the archaeological imagination and contemporary practice: Chapters 3 and 6 include three imaginative narratives—fact-based stories that weave together archaeological remains and historical accounts into vignettes of daily life. While the data that inform each of these pieces are carefully footnoted, the narrative approach itself is controversial. Some readers may feel that the line between fictionalized accounts and documented events has been inappropriately blurred; others may agree with archaeological theorist Rosemary Joyce, who has written that “archaeological writing is storytelling” (2002:4).

We hope that this volume will help redirect the practice of historical archaeology in the CRM sector toward a more seamless melding of history and archaeology. Historical archaeology is commonly defined as the archaeology of the historic period, archaeology with a written record, or even the archaeology of capitalism. Historical archaeology as taught in academia is problem-driven and practiced by researchers seeking answers to specific questions from data extracted from sites that match their interests. It is research-based, and sites, which are often of monumental size or scope and have visible and known perimeters, are chosen for their applicability to the research issue at hand. Historians, by and large, approach their research themes from a different perspective that focuses on people, events, and processes that have shaped the living conditions of a defined place at a point in time. This type of research is often based on primary sources and the broad backdrop of events and processes as currently interpreted by historians.

Unlike academic archaeology, historical archaeology in the CRM context is location-based, a focus it shares with historical enquiry. CRM, however, is constrained to known impacts from specific projects in specific places; the research area is an artificial construct determined by a client, and site boundaries often conform to project limits. To compound this potential handicap, research areas in the CRM context are often marginal—freeways and reservoirs are generally not proposed for upscale neighborhoods or prime venues. To justify the contribution of their work, historical archaeologists in the CRM world are sometimes asked to juxtapose the archaeological data with the archival data, to interpret the two data sets as if they are separate entities rather than separate sources of information about the same phenomena. This makes for devalued archaeology and weak history; historical archaeology without history is like words

Figure 1.9. A beautiful tea set from the bottom of a well. This set is decorated with a transfer-printed design called India Tree, manufactured by the W.T. Copeland and Sons pottery of Staffordshire, England. It was found at the bottom of a well at 1768 Atlantic Street that was abandoned around 1905. The elegant tea set probably once belonged to John and Emma Weisheimer, a German house painter and his American-born wife. The Weisheimer’s apparently enjoyed serving tea, as three other teapots were also found in the well.
without grammar. As both a method and an academic discipline, historical archaeology is a nexus for information and insights from documentary, oral, and material sources.

Our position is that the inherent locational focus of CRM-based archaeology need not be a handicap. People in the past made, purchased, used, reused, discarded, and abandoned the material objects contained in the strata that compose the archaeological record (Figure 1.9). Good history and good archaeology can situate these people at a point in time, often at a point in their life cycle. When this happens, remarkable snapshots of the past emerge that can be used to bring different voices and perspectives to our common history, as well as to bring that history to new audiences who are more receptive to visual images and small-scale analysis that speaks to everyday things they understand.

Thus, historical archaeology in CRM—precisely because it is location-based—offers a new way to approach local history. What we are suggesting and what we have tried to do on the Cypress Archaeology Project is to combine the archaeological and archival data as seamlessly as possible to approach topics of interest to social scientists and the local community. Our topics have a material-culture base, but are not driven exclusively by material culture. The subjects of our snapshots were greatly influenced by material culture, from houses to parlor bric-a-brac, but their lives were also influenced by a myriad of other factors.

**DATASETS: HOW TO FIND AND USE THEM**

The Cypress Project generated a wealth of information, but these data can be overwhelming and difficult to control. A number of aids are presented in this section to guide readers through this volume and the attached BTRs, so that they can readily use or reuse the data presented herein.

**Addresses and Features**

This volume discusses features at dozens of addresses on 17 city blocks, an area we have divided into three neighborhoods for analytical purposes. Figure 1.10 is a map indicating block numbers and neighborhoods that are referred to throughout the volume and used for statistical analyses in Appendixes F and G. Table 1.2 is a concordance by address that will enable the reader to quickly tie addresses to the blocks and neighborhoods used in this study. The BTRs are organized by blocks and addresses. Authors in this volume refer parenthetically to feature numbers when discussing findings. Working with Feature Associations (Appendix C) and Table 1.2, the reader can find the appropriate BTR, where all the data are presented in a standardized format. Parcel-specific historical data are presented on Documentary Research Tables and summarized in Parcel Overviews. Excavation data are presented in Matrix, Section, and Parcel Plan drawings. Artifacts and faunal remains are presented in various standardized tables and photographs.

**Features and Analytical Categories**

Some of our studies required that households be categorized for analysis into one of several occupational categories. Except for Chapter 7, which uses a craft-based system, our divisions are those commonly used by American social historians since Thernstrom (1973) and subsequently employed by Etherton in his 1994 work on San Francisco. What we call Wealthy Professional, or P+, on Table 1.3 is Etherton’s High White-Collar; our Professional, or P, is his Low White-Collar; Skilled, Semiskilled, and Unskilled are the same in both classifications,
Table 1.2. Study Block Concordance by Address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBERED STREETS</th>
<th>NAMED STREETS (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fifth Street</strong></td>
<td>Filbert Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654 Fifth</td>
<td>810 Filbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>658 Fifth</td>
<td>812 Filbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>662 Fifth</td>
<td>813 Filbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>666 Fifth</td>
<td>815 Filbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668 Fifth</td>
<td>817 Filbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712 Fifth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718 Fifth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>762 Fifth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>766 Fifth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>768 Fifth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770 Fifth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772 Fifth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>914 Fifth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sixth Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>663 Sixth</td>
<td>816/818 Linden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>667 Sixth</td>
<td>822 Linden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>669 Sixth</td>
<td>824 Linden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>671 Sixth</td>
<td>830 Linden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679 Sixth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711 Sixth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713 Sixth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715/717 Sixth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721 Sixth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719 Sixth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>765 Sixth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seventh Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801/1805 Seventh</td>
<td>810/812 Myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802 Seventh</td>
<td>814/816 Myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813 Seventh</td>
<td>817 Myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868/1874 Seventh</td>
<td>818 Myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880 Seventh</td>
<td>822 Myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Named Streets</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Street</td>
<td>Pine Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776 Atlantic</td>
<td>812 Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768 Atlantic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820 Atlantic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brush Street</strong></td>
<td>Short Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802 Brush</td>
<td>1825 Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806 Brush</td>
<td>1856 Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812 Brush</td>
<td>1860 Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Castro Street</strong></td>
<td>William Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>809 Castro</td>
<td>1708 William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812 Castro</td>
<td>1712 William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cedar Street</strong></td>
<td>1821 William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>881 Cedar</td>
<td>1823/1825 William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>883 Cedar</td>
<td>1827 William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>889 Cedar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wood Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793 Wood</td>
<td>1827 William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1.10. Cypress Archaeological Project Blocks
although no semiskilled workers were identified in this study. Our classification is summarized as follows:

- Wealthy Professional (High White-Collar). Banker, real-estate developer, capitalist, brewery owner.
- Professional (Low White-Collar). Clerk, plumber (own business), barber (own business), merchant, druggist, bridge-builder, department foreman, butcher (own business).
- Skilled. Porter, contractor, conductor, peddler, music teacher, fireman, carpenter, machinist, fisherman, painter, hairdresser, barber, butcher, well-borer.
- Unskilled. Laborer, cleaner.

Table 1.3 shows the date, occupational classification, neighborhood, tenure, and dwelling type for the features used in the statistical analyses.

Dwelling type proved to be an important variable in our statistical analyses. These types were defined by Paul Groth and Marta Gutman (1997) and are summarized as follows:

- Informal Workers’ Cottage (Figure 1.11). Small, open-lot dwelling with minimal side yards, one story or one story with basement. Usually wood-frame construction; two or three-room core (sometimes four); informal circulation, unspecialized rooms, and a back-porch toilet are common; additions often double or triple size of initial building. Frequently occupied by owners or leased from neighbor-owners, with high densities of people per room (extended families, boarders and roomers are common); across-town owners possible, but not common.

Figure 1.11. View of the Jackson/Netherland cottage, 714 Pine Street. This 1995 photograph shows the cottage just a few months before it was moved from its original location. The residence was recorded in detail as part of the Cypress Project (Groth and Gutman 1997:35-38) and is a classic example of an Informal workers’ cottage. Note the BART train to the right. (Photo credit: Paul Groth)
Table 1.3. Archaeological Features and Categories Used for Statistical Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ethnicity/Origin</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Dwelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>1878 ca.</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Scots/Irish</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>1880 ca.</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>1880 ca.</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>1880 ca.</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>P+</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>1880 ca.</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>R/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>933, 1112</td>
<td>1880s early</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1885 ca.</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>P+</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>1889 ca. - 1896 ca.</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>1889 ca. - 902</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>928, 929</td>
<td>1908 ca.</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1876 - 1880</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1376</td>
<td>1880 ca.</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1404, 1452, 1461</td>
<td>1880s ca.</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1358, 1372</td>
<td>1880s early</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1431</td>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1321B</td>
<td>1880s mid</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1409</td>
<td>1880s mid</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1387</td>
<td>1880s early</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>1890 ca.</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>1900 ca.</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>1900 ca.</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1703, 1704, 1705, 1706</td>
<td>1906 ca.</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>1874 ca.</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>P+</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>1880 ca.</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>1884 ca.</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3382</td>
<td>1875 ca.</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3106, 3119</td>
<td>1880 ca.</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3137</td>
<td>1880 ca.</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3196</td>
<td>1880 ca.</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3185</td>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3139</td>
<td>1880s early</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3178</td>
<td>1880s early</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3346</td>
<td>1890 ca.</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3300, 3301</td>
<td>1890s ca.</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3830</td>
<td>1875 ca. - 1880</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
### Table 1.3. Archaeological Features and Categories Used for Statistical Analyses (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ethnicity/Origin</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Dwelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>1880 ca.</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3802</td>
<td>1880s early</td>
<td>Scots</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3828</td>
<td>1880s early</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4243</td>
<td>1877 ca.</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4220</td>
<td>1880 ca.</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4245</td>
<td>1880 ca.</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4239</td>
<td>1880s early</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4281</td>
<td>1880s early</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4234</td>
<td>1887 ca.</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4236, 4237</td>
<td>1890s early</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10102</td>
<td>1890 ca.</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>8445</td>
<td>1890s mid</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6270</td>
<td>1870s early</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6282</td>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6239</td>
<td>1880s early</td>
<td>German/English</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6260</td>
<td>1880s early</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6300</td>
<td>1880s early</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6292</td>
<td>1880s mid</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6325</td>
<td>1880s mid</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7511</td>
<td>1890s early to mid</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7175</td>
<td>1900 ca.</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>1905 ca.</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5293</td>
<td>1875 ca.</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5200</td>
<td>1900 ca.</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5237</td>
<td>1908 ca.</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1893 ca.</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>W/P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>559, 579</td>
<td>1900-1915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>1909 ca.</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2784, 2787C</td>
<td>1880 ca.</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2786, 2864, 2873, 2874</td>
<td>1880 ca.</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2822</td>
<td>1880 ca.</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>P/U</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2809, 2812</td>
<td>1880s ca.</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>P/U</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2719</td>
<td>1890s ca.</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2855</td>
<td>1900 ca.</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2870</td>
<td>1900 ca.</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1900 ca.</td>
<td>English/U.S.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O/T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2404</td>
<td>1900 ca.</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4714</td>
<td>1870s early</td>
<td>Prussian</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
Table 1.3. Archaeological Features and Categories Used for Statistical Analyses (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ethnicity/Origin</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Dwelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4724, 5112</td>
<td>1870s late</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4600A</td>
<td>1870s-1880s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4648</td>
<td>1880s</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4731, 5167, 5169</td>
<td>1880s mid-late</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4600B</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2504</td>
<td>1890s late</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2524</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1878 ca.</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1880 ca.</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1882 ca.</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key
- **Occupation**: P+ = Wealthy Professional, P = Professional, S = Skilled, SS=Semi-Skilled (lumped w/Skilled), U = Unskilled, W = Widow, L = Landlady.
- **Tenure**: T = Tenant, O = Owner, U = Unknown
- **Neighborhood**: E = East of Market, W = West of Market, O = Oakland Point

---

**WHAT WE DID AND WHAT WE FOUND**

The Cypress Archaeology Project may have been the largest urban archaeological excavation ever undertaken in the western United States.

The decision to reroute the freeway through this historic neighborhood had enormous consequences, not the least for urban archaeology in North America. The Cypress Project has created a database of archaeological assemblages from a wide variety of class and ethnic populations that is unequalled in the West.

**By the Numbers…**

- √ 78: weeks of archaeological fieldwork (April 1994 to May 1996)
- √ 22: city blocks tested
- √ 227-240: building lots excavated (depending on date of map consulted)
- √ 2,580: archaeological features discovered
- √ 121: NRHP-eligible features excavated
- √ 100: households represented by important features
- √ 427,967: artifacts and ecofacts found
- √ 1853-1911: date range of households represented

- 1850s: 1
- 1860s: 0
- 1870s: 16
- 1880s: 51
- 1890s: 15
- 1900s: 16
- 1910s: 1
• Almost-Polite House (Figure 1.12). Small open-lot dwelling with small side yards, one story or one story with basement. Usually wood-frame construction; permanently specialized space, hierarchical organization of rooms (five to six minimum), specialized circulation. Minimally, but clearly, reflects spatial and social orders of much larger middle-income homes, with entry foyer, separate front rooms for entertaining (parlor, sitting room, and/or dining room); sleeping rooms screened from public view, with separate bedrooms for adults and children. Kitchen is made for the purpose, may be largest room of house; toilets generally inside dwelling or on back porch. Owner-occupiers, neighborhood owners, or across-town owners; high densities of people per room possible due to extended families, boarders or roomers. Built at one time, with attention paid to architectural style and decoration; additions are minor with respect to whole building.

Figure 1.12. View of the Stephens/Wood house at 1817 Shorey Street. The residence was recorded in detail as part of the Cypress Project (Groth and Gutman 1997:53-60); it is a classic example of an Almost-polite house. The façade matches polite styles that could be found in much more expensive neighborhoods. In this picture, the windows are boarded up in preparation for moving the house in advance of freeway construction. (Photo credit: Paul Groth)
• Polite Victorian House. Large open-lot dwelling (often two+ stories) with ample yards. Usually wood-frame construction, permanently specialized space, hierarchical organization of rooms (six or more), specialized circulation. Entry foyer, corridors, and stairs (two possible), formal front rooms for polite entertaining, with separate dining room and parlor being most important; sleeping rooms screened from public view (upstairs), with separate bedrooms for parents, boys, and girls. Kitchen is made for the purpose; toilets can be inside dwelling; accommodation usually provided for servants. Usually owners occupy, with low densities of people per room (although extended families are common and boarders possible). Built at one time, with great attention paid to architectural style and decoration.

To these we have added a few less-common types: Duplex (Informal workers’ cottage divided into two residential units) and Simple (two-story residence larger than cottage but without “polite” aspects).

Finding Research Design Topics in this Volume

The interpretive report on our investigations consists of several components:

• This volume, which contains essays about the social history of West Oakland, including consumerism, ethnicity and urban subcultures, the archaeology of class and gender, and lodging;

• Appendixes on compact disk, which describe the project timeline, outreach products, feature associations by block, feature “snapshots,” a narrative excavation log, and statistical analyses of food bones and other materials;

• Block Technical Reports and artifact catalog on compact disk.

Table 1.4 guides the reader to topics of interest in “Putting the ‘There’ There.” The research design defined six principal THEMES to which data developed by the Cypress Archaeology Project might contribute: Consumer behavior/strategies, Ethnicity/urban subcultures, Industrialization/technology, Urban geography, Waste disposal, and Public interpretation. Each theme was further subdivided in the research design into TOPICS, many of which are further addressed in Table 1.4 as FOCI. The results of field, lab, and analytical work were not applicable to some themes; these cases are so noted.

Questions Asked, Answered, and Posed

Yentsch writes that, in applying the method of interpretive archaeology, “one begins with a set of questions, revises them through enquiry, and . . . the end becomes another beginning because the questions shift and change, responding to the data” (1994:321). In this view, archaeological analysis is complex, and explanations are constructed through both deduction and induction. The object is not to make exclusively archaeological discoveries of fact, but rather to weave data from a variety of sources into a multifaceted interpretation. Similarly, the documentary and archaeological records are not conceived of as having a hierarchical relationship. Each has its own strengths and flaws, and complements the other’s perspective. Folklorist Henry Glassie puts it well, writing: “When documents accompany artifacts, it would be foolish to
Table 1.4. Research Foci and Where to Find them in this Volume

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Foci</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Consumer Behavior and Strategies</td>
<td>Consumer and disposal practices of well-documented</td>
<td>Heath and nutrition [Chaps. 3 and 6]. Symbolic dimension of consumer artifacts; domesticity and aesthetics [Chap. 4]. Use of imported foodstuffs and traditional technologies by Chinese [Chap. 8]. Assemblages linked with households documented in Block Technical Reports [CD in envelope].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>households.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial assemblages as indicators of the availability of consumer goods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptive behavior in the acquisition/consumption of food and use of space.</td>
<td>Evidence of fishing, hunting, and home food production; food from the bay and mudflats; artifact repair and reuse; building up and building on [Chap. 5]. Women’s use of back yards [Chap. 6]. Rooming houses as adaptation [Chap. 9]. Evidence of fishing and hunting [Chap. 5]. Non-conventional economics/barter; [Chap. 11]. Greek ethnic and gendered use of space [Chap. 5].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape alteration and water/waste management, in relation to household change.</td>
<td>Data not forthcoming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ethnicity and Urban Subcultures</td>
<td>Influence of and resistance to Victorianism and consumer culture. The rise of post-Victorian mores.</td>
<td>Material culture of Spirituality [Chap. 3]. Use of artifacts to create an African American aesthetic [Chaps. 4 and 10]. Victorian values and “Polite” and “Almost-polite” houses [Chap. 6]. Diet and Victorian class-specific ideals [Chap. 7]. Changes in African American aesthetics and politics [Chap. 10].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dynamics of cultural pluralism and stratification. Women’s lives. Influence of wealth and ethnicity on household material culture.</td>
<td>Relationship between food and wealth, neighborhood, gender, and ethnicity [Chap. 3]. Domestic ideology and the feminine ideal [Chaps. 4 and 6]. Exotism and the relationship between whites, blacks, and Chinese [Chaps. 4 and 8]. Sewing and women’s work in the home [Chaps. 5 and 6]. Women’s work, income, and home life; domestic reform and children [Chap. 6]. Dietary preference, ethnicity, craft identity, and class [Chap. 7]. Rooming houses and opportunity for women; material culture of rooming houses and hotels [Chap. 9]. Music, “race work” and unionism [Chap. 10]. Emic social divisions [Chap 11]. Immigrant Jews, food, and cultural exchange [Chap. 3].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Foci</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Industry and technology</td>
<td>Documenting industrial processes.</td>
<td>Material culture of Chinese laundry [Chap. 8].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management/worker relations.</td>
<td>Data not forthcoming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industrialization, environment, and public health</td>
<td>Response to tuberculosis in Oakland [Chap. 3]. Declining use of wild/noncommercial foods [Chap. 5].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Urban Geography</td>
<td>Urban infrastructure.</td>
<td>Illicit refuse disposal [Chaps. 5 and 10]. Sewers and the end of the outhouse [Chap. 5].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship between environmental perception and public policy.</td>
<td>Landscape heterogeneity, “urban blight,” and neighborhood vitality [Chaps. 8, 10, and 11].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential/neighborhood differentiation.</td>
<td>Geography of rental housing [Chap. 9]. Multiethnic households and neighbors [Chap 10].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Municipal Waste Disposal</td>
<td>Citywide consumption and disposal.</td>
<td>Garbage disposal [Chap. 5], sewerage [Chap. 11].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implications for health and landfill design.</td>
<td>Sewerage and health [Chap 11].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Public Interpretation</td>
<td>Households of known ethnicity/occupation to provide neighborhood continuity through time.</td>
<td>Many examples, including Chinese-American Ah-Tye family [Chap. 8] and African American families [Chap. 10]. Public and professional interpretation [Appendix B]. Household associations and summary of each assemblage [Appendixes C and D, respectively].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artifacts for public display or school use.</td>
<td>Non-NRHP eligible assemblages distributed to schools. Public displays [Appendix B].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ignore them. But it would be no less a mistake to assume that they say the same thing and that the document is the more reliable source” (1999:46).

We have brought in various collaborators and asked them to address the research themes posed in the Cypress Archaeology Project research design from their particular theoretical perspective. We gave these authors the freedom to explore topics of interest to them using the data presented in the BTRs. Their individual findings may bolster or contradict those of others in the same volume. Even interpretations of feature associations and meaning may differ. This is to be expected and was a goal of the BTR format—to allow other researchers to interpret the data for themselves. This volume in no way exhausts the research potential of the Cypress material; some questions posed in the research design have yet to be explored; other new questions will be posed in the concluding chapter. We do not have all the questions and certainly no claim to all the answers. The BTRs are attached to this volume and are available through Caltrans and the ASC on a compact disk in hopes that readers will be inspired to use the data in their own work for comparative purposes or to build upon what we have started here.

This volume is divided into four parts. Each part contains main essays (structured as chapters), short essays, and sidebars. The short essays (some of which are actually quite long) connect thematically with the main essay and are focused on specific self-contained topics. Some cover relevant historical topics, others cover purely archaeological manifestations, and some range between both sources. Sidebars present the “minor illustrative material,” generally archaeological in nature, in hopes to catch the general reader’s interest in what was found. Each chapter, essay, and sidebar is a stand-alone piece; readers need not feel compelled to read from start to finish, but are encouraged to jump around the volume at will.

Part I contains two main essays. This, the first, presents an introduction to the Cypress Project—the project’s how, why, when, where, and whom. It briefly describes our methods and research questions, while referring the reader to the research design and treatment plan for further information (Praetzelis 1994). It outlines the project history and the resulting related products and reports. It also discusses our vision of historical archaeology in the CRM context and our vision for this volume. Additional supporting data are included in the appendixes, including a feature-association list by block and selected feature snapshots, which provide a one-page graphical representation of findings. The second essay in Part I condenses the background chapter written for the project by Nancy Olmsted and Roger W. Olmsted (1994).

Part II tackles consumerism, the first main theme of the project research design, by exploring the consumption and disposal practices of project-area residents in three main essays. The first, “Consumerism, Living Conditions, and Material Well-Being,” is a straightforward study of evidence from particular households relating to the material aspects of life that contribute to comfort and satisfaction: health and nutrition and consumer goods. It reaches some surprising conclusions regarding who was purchasing what and why. Short essays and sidebars cover a range of consumer goods—from clothes to cures to teapots—as well as the competing world-views of commercial capitalists and spiritualists. “Consuming Aspirations: Bric-A-Brac and the Politics of Victorian Materialism,” the second main essay, shifts scale and views the constant negotiation of conflicting personal, collective, institutional, and state interests in the “politicalized” symbolism of bric-a-brac purchases by project-area households. Like most popular culture, bric-a-brac was a self-possessed reflection of American society that presented back to consumers their deeply held preconceptions of themselves and others. The essay suggests that households could choose goods that symbolically situated them in places other than those dictated by social
and political realities. The third essay, “Outside the Marketplace: Adaptive Strategies and Self-Reliance, Making It and Making Do,” tackles the flip side of consumerism. What did households acquire outside the marketplace through hunting and gathering, growing, sewing, repairing, adapting? What did they recycle, reuse, or discard? How did these strategies differ by category (bottles vs. buildings) and through time? This main essay and supporting essays also address research questions relating to urban geography, the natural environment, and landscape modifications.

Part III addresses ethnicity and urban subcultures, our second major theme, in five main essays. “Busy as Bees: Women, Work, and Material Culture” examines the breadth of women’s work at home through the astonishing number and diversity of recovered artifacts associated with women’s work, as well as the meaning these artifacts held for specific households, taking into account the interests of domestic reformers in the neighborhood. This study looks at women’s work, including unpaid labor, as productive while recognizing the differentiation of women’s work along class, racial, and ethnic lines. “Aristocracies of Labor: Craft Unionism, Immigrants, and Working-Class Households” focuses on railroad occupations and categorizes project households along two axes, skill (i.e., craft organization) and origin (whether the head of household was native-born or immigrant). The essay studies basic standard of living as expressed in diet and examines how these groups of workers represented themselves using the discourse of Victorian material culture. “Chinese Oaklanders Overcoming the Odds” synthesizes research on Chinese laundries in the West and on the Chinese in Oakland, and highlights the important contributions of the Chinese to the settlement and development of the West. “The Landscapes of Lodging” examines room renting in West Oakland between 1880 and 1900, directing attention to the gender and material culture of room renters during a period of transition. “‘Black is Beautiful’: From Porter to Panther, Archaeologies of West Oakland’s African American Community” traces the African American community from initial settlement in the 1860s—when railroad porters and independent barbers settled in West Oakland—to the birth of the Black Panther Party, less than 100 years later.

Part IV consists of a single essay, “More than ‘Just a Place to Start From.’” Here we use information developed in earlier chapters and in the appendixes to examine and move past the characterization of West Oakland as a “slum” whose residents were the victims of irrational and self-destructive decisions. The volume concludes with an assessment of the Cypress Archaeology Project and suggestions to improve the conduct of urban historical archaeology.
The history of West Oakland is a chronicle of a dynamic community and the landscape that evolved around it. By far the most important force that molded and drove that community was the changing technology of transportation serving the economic development of California and the West. Perched at the edge of the continent on the San Francisco Bay, one of the world’s great natural harbors, West Oakland was destined from the start to become a key transportation nexus of the rapidly growing nation. Its location made it a natural interface between sea and land, East and West. The movement of people and goods continues to shape the human and geographical fabric of the area.

In its earliest period of development, the West Oakland region functioned as a suburban outpost of San Francisco. While the completion of the transcontinental railroad in 1869 brought a mixed blessing to the Pacific Coast as a whole, the selection of West Oakland as its western terminus gave the growing settlement a strong economic backbone and placed it in a national context. Directly or indirectly, the Central Pacific Railroad provided a wide variety of jobs to generations of West Oaklanders, largely defining the community’s polyglot and blue collar nature. Opportunities afforded by the railroad attracted an array of ethnic groups whose breadwinners filled the various niches within the corporate organization and local businesses. With the exception of some anti-Chinese sentiment, the American and immigrant subsets in the population mix seem to have gotten along fairly well. That general ethnic harmony became a point of pride and a valued part of West Oakland’s collective identity.

As local interurban railroad lines and other industries became electrified around 1911, a fondly remembered “Golden Age” began in the community, fueled economically by wartime industries and lasting until the onset of the Depression at the end of the 1920s. Although World War II again brought defense industries to West Oakland, it drew a huge influx of mostly government workers, changing the traditional nature of the place. “Progressive” government planners decided that the small cottages and houses that had defined West Oakland’s neighborhoods were not fit living spaces for modern laborers and their families, and replaced much of the old built environment with bleak housing projects.

With the decline of the railroad industry and the corresponding rise of the freeway system in the 1950s, West Oakland’s character continued to change. The Cypress Freeway, connecting the Nimitz Freeway with the Bay Bridge, was built above West Oakland’s streets, further marginalizing the community while setting the scene for the earthquake tragedy over two decades later. The Cypress structure became the boundary of continued urban-renewal projects of the 1950s and 1960s, ironically acting to protect original neighborhoods to the west. Relocation of the Cypress Freeway after the 1989 earthquake collapse resulted in the demolition of additional portions of existing original neighborhoods, primarily industrial/commercial buildings. Some 19th-century residences were moved to new locations. The mitigation mandated by the Section 106 process engendered the historical and archaeological research described in this report, recapturing otherwise lost details of life in West Oakland’s past.
THE ROUNDHOUSE
adapted from Olmsted and Olmsted (1994) by Robert Douglass

The engine roundhouse was the central focus of the West Oakland railroad yards and shops and provided jobs to generations of area residents. Steam locomotives were fairly individualized, custom-built machines, with few standardized parts. They required, consequently, the attention of master mechanics and custom parts fabrication by skilled machinists to keep them running. A roundhouse allowed locomotives to be driven onto a turntable and rotated, so that they could be run out on radial tracks into multiple covered work bays for maintenance and repairs. Each bay incorporated a pit between the rails so that mechanics could access the running gear. Some roundhouses actually were circular, or “round.” Many, like the Oakland Point engine roundhouse, consisted of a turntable with tracks radiating to an arc (rather than a complete circle) of roofed bays, forming a shape like a pie slice. The 1878 Thompson and West Historical Atlas Map shows only the original CRRP roundhouse (Thompson and West 1878). The 1911-1912 Sanborn insurance map shows three roundhouses: the original pie-shaped CPRR structure for servicing engines; a larger roundhouse a few hundred yards to the north, for the SPRR car shops; and a third roundhouse belonging to the Western Pacific Railroad to the south, near the foot of Adeline Street (Sanborn Map Company 1911-1912).

The decline of the railroads, as highway transport grew in the years after World War II, spelled the beginning of the end for the extensive West Oakland shops and yards. Most major railroads converted from steam power to new diesel locomotives with more mass-produced standardized parts between 1950 and 1956. Fewer shops, machinists, and mechanics were necessary to keep the trains running. By the late 1950s, the West Oakland yard operations had practically ceased. The obsolete engine roundhouse (and likely the car shop roundhouse, as well), no longer needed by the small crew of diesel mechanics, was torn down in 1960.

The original CPRR roundhouse at the West Oakland railroad yards and shops in the 1870s. (Photo courtesy of Bancroft Library)
PERALTA’S RANCHO SAN ANTONIO

The establishment of Spanish missions between 1770 and 1797 spelled the beginning of the end for the aboriginal way of life around San Francisco Bay. Native peoples were devastated by disease and other changes brought by contact with the mission system, and traditional lifeways were eliminated by 1810 (Levy 1978:486-496). In 1820 Luis María Peralta, commander of the guard at Mission San José from 1798 to 1800, obtained a grant to 10 square leagues of land that included the West Oakland project area. Peralta’s four sons occupied the vast holding, which was named the Rancho San Antonio. The land was formally divided among the sons in 1842, with José Vicente Peralta ending up in possession of the West Oakland area (Hoover et al. 1990:9). None of the original Peralta adobe house sites are near the project area.

Squatters, including lumbermen and cattle thieves who supplied San Francisco meat markets, were active on Peralta lands before the Gold Rush (Bagwell 1982:16-19; Davis 1929:251-253). Three squatters with speculative designs on Vicente Peralta’s land—Edson Adams, A. J. Moon, and lawyer Horace W. Carpentier—settled near the foot of present-day Broadway around 1850. They appear to have been challenging the validity of the rancho grant under the American administration. An armed posse led by Peralta and a deputy sheriff failed to eject the three, and their efforts may have actually resulted in a lease agreement with the offended owner (Bagwell 1982:27; Baker 1914:356). Other squatters flooded in: by 1852 around 50 were each claiming 160-acre parcels on the Rancho San Antonio. The shrewd Carpentier and his partners soon had their three 160-acre claims surveyed into a gridiron town site they called Oakland and began to sell lots. Carpentier, by now appointed enrolling clerk of the state legislature, succeeded in passing a bill incorporating the town. He was elected to the state assembly in 1853, and when the legislature officially recognized Oakland as a city the following year, he became its first mayor. Carpentier, aptly nicknamed the “General,” reserved ownership of the entire Oakland waterfront, a commercial empire finally recovered by the city in 1911 after decades of legal wrangling.

The West Oakland project area is contained in lands that Vicente Peralta sold off to various parties in 1852 and 1853. Portions of Carpentier’s waterfront property are likely to be within the project area. The Peralta grant, issued by the last Spanish governor of California, was finally confirmed under United States laws in 1856. Oakland’s settlers banded together to resist any potential attempts to challenge ownership of their homesteads, but such challenges seem to have never materialized (Hoover et al. 1990:18).

GROWTH AND IDENTITY:
RAILROADS COME TO WEST OAKLAND

Through the 1860s, West Oakland remained semi-rural, offering different possibilities to different people, with its identity still fluid and tentative. Substantial homes on estate-sized parcels reflected the vision of some residents who saw the place as a long-term setting for genteel suburban retreats. Others, such as those who planned the Bayview Tract between Peralta and Center south of Seventh, viewed West Oakland as ideal for real estate speculation, where smaller row-house sized lots could be sold for tidy profit. At Oakland Point, a neighborhood of typical 19th-century main-street urban aspect took shape. Railway builders completed the San Francisco
& Oakland Railroad (SF&ORR) along Seventh Street in 1863, connecting central Oakland with the bay and ferries to San Francisco, and opening West Oakland up to increased settlement. By 1867, 60 children attended the public school there, and land was estimated to be worth $2,000.00 per acre (Halley 1876:177; *Oakland Daily News* 14 February 1867).

As the transcontinental railroad neared completion, Collis Huntington and his three Central Pacific Railroad (CPRR) partners made a decision critical to the development of West Oakland. The Big Four were eager to assemble a monopolistic network of local California railroads to connect with the national line, and wanted to extend the western transcontinental rails from Sacramento to the San Francisco Bay as a part of that effort. Although a route through San Jose up the peninsula to San Francisco was almost chosen, they instead decided on the Oakland Point wharf of the SF&ORR as the western terminus of the CP RR. The crucial decision resulted not from public debate or strictly geographical reasons, but because of a sweetheart deal between Oakland founder and waterfront czar, Horace Carpentier and the railroad men. The CP RR, through its subsidiary Western Pacific, received 500 acres and two rights-of-way for its terminal facilities, while Carpentier’s remaining Oakland assets skyrocketed in value (Scott 1959:48).

As a part of the plan, CP RR acquired the SF&ORR in 1869, assuming operation of the local trains and gaining the Seventh Street right-of-way (Figure 2.1). The shops and yards of the rail giant were constructed on a site just south of the Oakland Point wharf, and a freight line to bypass residential areas was built along First Street, angling out over the water from the yards to the wharf. CP RR rails linking a line from Sacramento through Niles Canyon to Oakland were completed in the fall of 1869. Improvements to extend the wharf to deep water went on between 1869 and 1871, with the resulting structure, named the Oakland Long Wharf, projecting more than two miles into the bay. In 1876 the company built a double-track line north along Cedar Street, connecting the wharf and yards to another Sacramento route via the Carquinez Straits. The rail and marine shipping facilities continued to expand through the 1870s, leading to the construction of a massive second wharf, or mole, just south of the Long Wharf, between 1879 and 1882. The Oakland Mole, as it came to be called, was built as a passenger-only facility and terminal far out over the bay, and was used by ferry travelers into the late 1950s.

The coming of the CP RR (which merged with the Southern Pacific Railroad [SP RR] in 1885) was the defining event in the development of the local community and landscape. The enormous hierarchy of jobs associated with company operations soon turned West Oakland, and especially the Oakland Point neighborhood, into a virtual railway workers’ village, where railroad craftsmen, operators, and administrators all worked and settled at the Point in great numbers. So did local business people whose hotels, markets, iron works, livery stables, photo studios, saloons, and “female boarding houses” in one way or other served the railroad and its employees or passengers. From 1869 to the 1930s, vast numbers of Point residents are listed in directories as working for the C.P.R.R. or (after 1885 the S.P. Co.)... [Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey (OCHS) 1990(2):29].

The character of the place was determined by the nature of the work that the railroad required. The Point grew into a neighborhood comprising mostly small and modest working- and middle-class dwellings (see Groth and Gutman 1997), punctuated by shops, small businesses and industries, boardinghouses, and hotels. It was strung together by the rail lines leading out to the east and north and fixed to the nucleus of rail yards and wharves.

In Oakland, late-19th-century union activity was primarily within the building industry. Early craft unions, more social brotherhoods than labor-advocacy organizations, had formed
Figure 2.1. Snow & Roos Bird’s-eye View of Oakland, 1870-1871, showing project area neighborhoods and landmarks. (Illustration courtesy of Bancroft Library)
A LONG WHarf WITH A MASSIVE MOLE

adapted from Olmsted and Olmsted (1994) by Robert Douglass

Bringing the transcontinental railroad to the San Francisco Bay required an efficient connection of freight and passengers with ferries and ships. When the CPRR acquired the existing Oakland Point pier in 1868, it was already more than a mile long. The railroad soon began constructing a series of improvements and extensions, and by 1871 multiple rail lines extended out over two miles of wharf into deep water. That year, the CPRR launched a freight ferry that could take 18 loaded rail cars at a time across to San Francisco. The new structure, known as the Oakland Long Wharf, allowed rail freight to be loaded directly onto and off of ocean-going vessels. A plan to connect the wharf to Yerba Buena Island was periodically mooted, but finally abandoned in 1873. Traffic soon outgrew the Long Wharf on account of expansion of the rail system in the 1870s. A massive wedge-shaped, rock-filled pier, or mole, was appended partway out along the wharf’s south edge between 1879 and 1882. The Oakland Mole, as it became known, was built to handle all of the passenger business, leaving the entire Long Wharf available for freight. The huge wood-framed train terminal covered more than 4 acres, with a cavernous maw gaping open on the bay to admit docking ferries. The Oakland Mole was Oakland’s main passenger depot all the way into the 1950s. Its importance faded with the decline of passenger railroads, and it was demolished in 1960.

The photograph shows the interior of the Oakland Mole passenger depot around 1931, in its bustling heyday. (Photo courtesy of San Francisco Maritime National Historic Park)

In the 1878 woodcut shown here, passenger trains come and go from dock-end terminals, while deep-water square riggers take on or discharge cargo. In the foreground, a crew of Overseas Chinese laborers awaits transportation between jobs.
(Source: Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Magazine 11 May 1878)
around individual railroad trades as early as 1863. In 1893 Eugene Debs, a locomotive fireman from Indiana, founded an inclusive industrial labor union, the American Railway Union (ARU), aimed at all rail workers (Douglas 1992:207, 210-211). The first major strike in the Bay Area played out in West Oakland, when local ARU members struck on 28 June 1894 in sympathy with Chicago-based Pullman Palace Car Company sleeping car builders as part of a called nationwide strike. The action in West Oakland, unsupported by the craft brotherhoods, was a flexing of labor muscle against the hated SRR rather than a demand for better wages or conditions. Debs had enjoined his membership against violence, but before the month-long strike was over, mob action (including an attempt to blow up a local train) brought in federal troops to suppress the strikers. The violence cost the ARU public support and worked in favor of the SRR.

WEST OAKLANDERS, 1870-1910

A wide variety of people came to work in West Oakland, to match the variety of labor niches that the railroad organization required. The many-tiered nature of work at a large railroad and its attendant trades and industries afforded opportunities to a wide spectrum of people. They ranged from poor, newly arrived immigrants to comfortably middle-class, native-born Americans with established skills and trades. The concept of “melting pot” is much debated. Taken merely to describe a coming together of disparate ethnic groups, West Oakland’s version of the melting pot in the late 19th century included populations of Portuguese, Germans, Irish, Chinese, Japanese, Americans of African and of European extraction, and numerous others.

The Portuguese, many from the Azores and Hawaii, while well-represented in the maritime industries, also came to work for the railroad, primarily as laborers rather than tradesmen (OCHS 1990 [2]:48). By 1892 Oakland was considered the unofficial Portuguese capital of California. They were often characterized as upwardly mobile, working to save for eventual purchases of farms. Germans who came to West Oakland were frequently property owners who operated retail shops and other small businesses. Many were carpenters, although more often than not they worked at building houses rather than for the Central Pacific. They were the second-largest ethnic group in the project area in 1880. The largest group was the Irish, whose numbers within the project area continued to increase over the next 20 years (United States Bureau of the Census [U.S. Census] 1880). While Irish immigrants ran businesses such as the Charter Oak Hotel on Seventh Street (Block 23) and G. Culhane’s grocery and liquor store at Willow and Pacific (Block 18), they most often worked in the low-paying, labor-intensive jobs that came under the description of “laborer.”

Chinese shrimp fishermen apparently settled near the Point very early on, in the 1850s (Bagwell 1982:87). The coming of the railroad did not directly create jobs for Chinese immigrants in West Oakland: although Chinese labor crews were responsible for building much of the Central Pacific’s portion of the transcontinental line, local trade unionists barred them from employment in the shops and yards. In 1880, six live-in domestic employees worked within the eastern project area, and a Chinese laundry operated on Block 30 (U.S. Census 1880). In 1903–1904, Chinese entrepreneur Lew Hing relocated his large cannery from San Francisco to West Oakland. The factory, five blocks north of the project area, became seasonally one of the area’s largest employers of Chinese labor, as well as of Portuguese and Italian women (OCHS 1990 [2]:50). A small Japanese community also existed within the project area, on Block 2 or 3, in the 1880s and 1890s. This 20-member enclave was associated with the Japanese Society, which
THE ARU STRIKE OF 1894  
adapted from Olmsted and Olmsted (1994) by Robert Douglass

The mid-1890s found the country gripped in a depression, causing increased labor union activity. The American Railway Union (ARU), which sought to organize all railway workers without regard to individual job or craft, called a nationwide strike on 28 June 1894 to support striking Pullman car builders in Chicago. Membership in Oakland had no specific local grievances beyond the traditional general distrust and resentment of labor for corporate management: the action was viewed by both sides as a symbolic test of power between capital and organized labor. It also pitted the older established individual craft unions against the ARU.

By 30 June, Oakland train traffic was brought to a halt. The strike gained momentum as more workers signed on with the ARU, and on 5 July strikers invaded the yards, taking possession and compelling those remaining at their jobs to halt work. Local trains attempting to leave the mole were stopped by large crowds that included hundreds of women and children, some of whom joined men in lying across the tracks to make their point. Others in the crowd removed non-ARU firemen and engineers, none too gently, from their engines. Railroad management now asked for government help (San Francisco Examiner 5 July 1894).

ARU founder Eugene Debs called for avoiding violence, and beyond isolated rock-throwing and rough treatment of some by the mob, real violence had been thus far averted in Oakland. Things took an ominous turn in West Oakland when ARU men from Dunsmuir and Sacramento reportedly brought in boxcars of rifles and blasting powder (Oakland Enquirer 7 July 1894). Confrontations erupted between billy-clubbing police and strikers wielding fence pickets, and state and federal troops finally arrived in West Oakland around 10 July. Near Sacramento on 11 July, dynamite placed under a trestle derailed an Oakland-bound train, killing an engineer and four soldiers. After clashes between troops and strikers, momentum began to swing in the SPRR’s favor, and Debs ordered a conditional halt to the strike on 13 July. Since the company would not meet their conditions, local strike leaders kept the strike going. An attempt was made to blow up a local train at Seventh and Kirkham streets, with little damage. The violent incidents and train service disruptions turned public opinion against the strikers, and the men began to go back to work. The last diehards gave in by 1 August (Leach 1917:270).

This engraving illustrates an incident early in the strike, when three men in a row had been induced to leave their jobs rather than to turn the semaphore switch at Seventh and Webster streets so that the local train could pass. Miss Tilson, a company station agent, faced the hostile crowd and turned the switch. She was jeered but not otherwise mistreated. (Source: Oakland Enquirer 3 July 1894)
boarded and educated new immigrants from Japan, and operated a restaurant (Oakland Enquirer 28 June 1894).

Over the years, Oakland’s Chinese were subjected to the same hostility encountered elsewhere in the state (see Yang 1999:21-22). The Workingmen’s Party, a movement to remove cheap Chinese labor from the American job market, had brief but substantial support in Oakland. This was evidenced by the election of the exclusionist party’s candidate, W. R. Andrus, as mayor of Oakland in 1878 and 1879, and a countywide referendum on Chinese exclusion in 1879 that resulted in a 9,401-to-36 vote against further Chinese immigration (Wood 1883:279-280, 839).

In 1880, 48 percent of household heads within the project area were American-born. They came primarily from the Northeast and Midwest, with a smaller number from the South. Represented among those southerners were six African American households (U.S. Census 1880). A small black community may have existed in the vicinity of Blocks 22 and 23 in pre-railroad days, as early as the beginning of the 1860s (Hinkel and McCann 1939 [2]:418-420; OCHS 1990 [2]:50). Four of the six African American household heads in 1880 were the vanguard of what would become a West Oakland core group: railroad porters working for the Pullman Palace Car Company. Pullman built and operated the enclosed sleeping cars pulled by various railroads throughout a nationwide network, and the Oakland CPRR terminus naturally became a western hub for the car company as well. By 1900, 30 men living in the project area were employed in the service sector of the railroad industry as Pullman porters, cooks, and waiters. When this labor force organized into the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters and the Dining Car and Cooks Union, Oakland became their West Coast headquarters. The economic foothold of opportunity afforded by railroad work in West Oakland soon led to African American men branching out into such other jobs as carpentry, painting, carpetlaying, barbering, hotel work, and bartending; and to African American women working as hairdressers, dressmakers, boardinghouse keepers, domestics, nurses, and midwives. At the turn of the century, most of the African Americans within the project area owned or rented homes on Blocks 1 through 10 (U.S. Census 1900).

Native-born Americans of European descent dominated professional trade and white-collar jobs in West Oakland, in addition to the economic niche of those describing themselves as “capitalists.” Familiarity with the language, government, and economic system gave them an advantage over most new immigrants, with the possible exception of Germans, who were also fairly well-off as a group. In the 1880s households belonging to wealthier professional and managerial-level breadwinners were concentrated north of Seventh and east of Adeline, while residences along and south of Seventh, and around the railroad yards belonged to blue-collar immigrants. In the project area, the upwardly trending white Americans of the 1880s lived almost entirely in Blocks 1 through 10. Despite this general trend, an element of economic blurring existed in those wealthier neighborhoods, with a fair number of unskilled or semi-skilled immigrant laborer households mingled with the white-collar professional homes. By the early 1900s, those households supported by higher-scale jobs had all but disappeared, and West Oakland had become more uniformly immigrant and blue collar.

While the Point moved toward economic homogeneity, the multicultural nature of its population remained. Other ethnic groups, including Italians, French, Greeks, Slavs, and Mexicans, were also part of West Oakland’s mix, growing in numbers in the 20th century. With a few exceptions, West Oakland’s various groups seem to have coexisted harmoniously over the years. The notable exceptions were 19th-century anti-Chinese sentiment, which was epidemic to the whole state, and later, some almost-ritualized conflict between ethnic youth gangs.
INDUSTRIALIZATION AND PROSPERITY: REACHING BEYOND THE RAILROAD

The 1906 earthquake left West Oakland virtually unscathed. By sparing the community, however, the quake affected it nonetheless. As peninsular San Francisco’s primary transportation portal to the interior, West Oakland’s wharves and railways assumed new importance. A flood of refugees went out from, and vast amounts of rescue and recovery materials went into, the quake- and fire-ravaged city by way of the Point, setting an industrial and population growth spurt in motion. Many San Francisco businesses that had been wiped out by the quake and fire relocated to West Oakland or elsewhere in the East Bay, rather than rebuilding at their old locations. Increased labor needs of such industries seem to have resulted in a demographic shift: comparison of the 1900 and 1910 census data shows a decrease in single family households and a greater number of lodgers over the decade (U.S. Census 1900, 1910). There was no jump in residential construction, suggesting that existing homes were converted to accommodate boarding situations (OCHS 1990 [2]:38). Grain milling, canning, lumber planing, iron works, and miscellaneous light manufacturing were some of the types of industries moving into West Oakland at the time (Sanborn Map Company 1911-1912). Many of them moved into newly filled tidal lands near the railroad yards and elsewhere along the waterfront, surrounding rather than displacing the existing residential neighborhood.

Electrification of local railways came early to Oakland, which by 1892 had one of the most extensive networks in the nation (Bagwell 1982:68). That year, the Eighth Street horse car line into West Oakland was electrified. By 1902, “Borax” Smith’s Key System had established electric train lines from outlying suburbs to a new ferry pier at the present Bay Bridge alignment. The quiet, clean electrics were much preferred by Oaklanders over the smoky, chugging steam engines still used by the SPRR on its local lines, and in 1908, the railroad giant began electrification of its locals. The Seventh Street rail line that formed the axis of West Oakland was converted by 1911, and the new Red Trains were immediately popular with local travelers. Local historian Vernon J. Sappers (1993) viewed the advent of the Red Trains as marking the start of a nearly two-decade-long “Golden Age” for West Oakland. The direct effect of the change was a great improvement to the quality of life along the Seventh Street corridor as the air and noise pollution of the old engines disappeared. Indirectly, the line actually increased train traffic on Seventh Street, and the improved access to new peripheral suburbs may have hastened the departure of some families from the Point. The line was extended almost to San Leandro in 1913. The electric locals opened up new outlying areas for development, and true suburban living became more attainable for more urban middle-class householders.

World War I ushered in a new level of economic activity in West Oakland, with the expansion of existing firms such as the Moore & Scott shipyard at the foot of Chestnut and Adeline streets, and with new industries coming to the area. With a growing fleet of ferries, the SPRR also operated their own shipyard at the Point. The influx of workers brought new prosperity to local consumer businesses. Commuter traffic to San Francisco grew as well. Seventh Street was not only the route for the Red Trains that ran every 20 minutes, but had become the main artery for growing automobile traffic to and from the auto ferries now run by the SPRR. Business along the corridor boomed, continuing through the 1920s.
RED TRAINS IN A GOLDEN AGE

adapted from Olmsted and Olmsted (1994) by Robert Douglass

Francis Marion “Borax” Smith had made a fortune mining borax in the deserts of southern California. He turned to East Bay real estate development in the 1890s, shrewdly realizing that an efficient transportation network would turn cheap rural land into valuable suburbs. Acquiring various local rail lines, he had consolidated them by 1902 into a single electrified system, known as the Key System, linked to cross-bay ferries at a pier adjacent to the present Bay Bridge alignment, within shouting distance of the Oakland Long Wharf.

E. H. Harriman started out as a New York stockbroker, but decided instead to make his fortune in railroads. He began to take over poorly managed lines and make them successful. By 1901 Harriman had obtained the SPRR and controlled more railroads than any other single American. He reportedly harbored a personal dislike for Borax Smith, and was rankled when Key System trains came into the SPRR's Oakland stronghold. The electrics — quieter, cleaner, and simply more modern than the old steam locals—were immensely popular with East Bay commuters. In 1908 Harriman began to electrify the SPRR's locals, and like all of his projects, made a first-rate, state-of-the-art job of it. The Seventh Street line was completely rebuilt by 1911 to handle the heavy, independently powered cars, costing the company millions but gaining much local goodwill. The corporate giant had showed it cared about the community. Gone were the noisy, chugging steam locomotives casting their sooty pall along the route. The improvement in quality of life that the new Red Trains brought changed the character of the historic corridor through West Oakland, making large areas much more livable.

This was the first electric train to run down Seventh Street, on 13 December 1911. The event was viewed by some as the start of a “Golden Age” for West Oakland, a period of prosperity that lasted until the Depression. Ironically, the efficient transportation provided by the Red Trains served to accelerate a middle-class exodus to more rural suburbs. (Photo reproduced with permission from Vernon J. Sappers)

While the ethnic makeup of the Point during this “Golden Age” has not been the subject of detailed study, it appears that the same mixture found there in the first decade of the century continued to characterize the area. The war and subsequent legislation restricted European immigration to the United States during the period, and was probably reflected somewhat in West Oakland’s populace. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the children of prewar Irish and Euroamerican railway workers moved away to other neighborhoods (West of Market Boys' Journal var.). An increase in African Americans from the South, gravitating to an established African American enclave, offset any declines. As the nation was poised on the brink of the economic collapse, West Oakland was a mature, ethnically mixed community of working- and middle-class residents, a pleasant place where people got along well.
JACK LONDON:
OAKLAND’S RELUCTANT NATIVE SON
Mary Praetzellis

The Oakland Visitor’s Bureau proudly proclaims Jack London Square as a “special spot at the water’s edge where places for shopping, dining, and day dreaming are all waiting for you.” Oakland exalts in the claim their city can make upon one of America’s most famous authors—visitors can follow the “wolf paws” etched on a path to London’s waterfront haunts. Ironically, Jack London had no such heartfelt ties to Oakland, although the city itself takes center stage in many of his best writings. Jack spent a painful adolescence in Oakland and fled the place and its memories at his first brush with success.

Jack London was born in San Francisco in 1876, the son of Flora Wellman, a runaway from a respectable Ohioan family and follower of spiritualist astrologer “Doctor” William Chaney, who is widely believed to have been Jack’s father. When Jack was still an infant, Flora married John London, a widower with two young children. The family lived briefly in Oakland from 1879 through 1881 and then moved back to Oakland when Jack was 10, after the family lost their Livermore ranch to foreclosure. The family’s fortunes continued on a steady decline from a position of middle-class respectability and land ownership to the precarious footing of the laboring class, John working by the hour as a night watchman and renting by the month. Flora contributed to the household’s income by sewing, teaching piano, and taking in roomers. Jack also worked, delivering newspapers, setting up pins in the bowling alley, and sweeping out saloons on Sundays (Stasz 1988:16-26). Between 1886 and 1891, the family moved no less than eight times, and many of their residences stood within a few blocks of the Cypress Freeway Replacement Project corridor (Haughey and Johnson 1987:8-16). Between 1888 and 1890, they lived at 807 Pine Street on Block 20, immediately adjacent to the Southern Pacific Railyards.

In Oakland Jack London discovered three things that framed his future: a love of books and knowledge at the public library, an attraction to liquor and desire for camaraderie at the public-house, and a dedication to the socialist cause and the struggle of the workingman in the factories and on the streets. Jack London graduated from grammar school in 1891 and took a job at Hickmott’s cannery to help out his family. Deciding not to be a “work-beast,” Jack left the factory and began a series of adventures as an oyster pirate, hobo, miner, socialist, and seaman. He sailed to Japan on a schooner and crossed the Chilkoot Pass to try his luck in the Klondike gold rush. Upon his return in 1899, Jack focused on writing as he penned stories about what he had seen on his travels. Houghton Mifflin published The Son of Sea Wolf, a collection of Yukon stories, in 1900; it proved to be in their top five sellers that year. Jack and his family left the flatlands of West Oakland for the more fashionable foothills in 1901, and in 1905 Jack London moved to rural Sonoma County and developed his “Beauty Ranch,” where he lived until his death in 1916 at age 40.

Jack London was an incredibly successful and prolific author. He wrote 1,000 words a day, often before lunch. To meet this goal, he wrote about things that he knew, and Oakland was one of those things. Oakland figures prominently in many of his best novels: The Iron Heel (1908), Martin Eden (1909), John Barleycorn (1913a), and Valley of the Moon (1913b), as well as in many essays and short stories.

Jack London at age 17.
(Photo courtesy of California Department of Parks and Recreation)
In his novel *Valley of the Moon*, Jack London sited his figurative struggle between Capital and Labor in West Oakland—a very logical choice, as the streets and railyards of this city had seen many actual battles. From the front window of his family's home on Pine Street, Jack had had a good view of the comings and goings at the Southern Pacific Railyards. It is from this cottage that Saxon, London’s heroine, witnessed a brutal confrontation between strikers and Pinkertons. The violence of the event caused the young woman to think deeply about the modern, urban way of life and to conclude that, in London’s words, “jobs are bones” (1913b:189) over which poor men fight; and that “the man-world was made by men, and a rotten job it was” (1913b:254). “Her eyes showed her only the smudge of San Francisco, the smudge of Oakland, where men were breaking heads and killing one another, where babies were dying, born and unborn, and where women were weeping with bruised breasts” (1913b:256). Even the clams that people gathered from the nearby marsh caused typhoid fever, “still another mark against Oakland, she reflected—Oakland, the man-trap, that poisoned those it did not starve” (London 1913b:286). Saxon's sentiments are hardly material for an Oakland Visitor’s Bureau brochure.

In the midst of her despair, Saxon meets a boy—who surely represents Jack London himself—who casually speaks the words that would change her life: “Oakland,” he says, “is just a place to start from” (London 1913b:267). Saxon then begins her journey to the rural Valley of the Moon, a natural world where men didn’t fight over bones.

But Jack London did not only write about labor and capital, he provides everyday details on what his characters wore, what they ate, their surroundings, their pastimes. Valley of the Moon, for example, touches on housework, cosmetics, underwear, fishing, gangs, prostitution, roomers, and the interior and neighboring surroundings of the cottage at 807 Pine—where London lived as a boy. All of his observations are in detail and all are specific to West Oakland. *Martin Eden*, the rags-to-riches story of a young West Oakland man who becomes a successful author, provides a wealth of detail on laundry work, Portuguese immigrants, dental care, rooming, and more (London 1909). References to this material can be found throughout this volume, which acknowledges a debt to the observations of Jack London.

Jack London’s boyhood home at 807 Pine Street on one of the Cypress Archaeology Project blocks. (Photo courtesy of California Department of Parks and Recreation)
DEPRESSION AND THE SECOND WORLD WAR

The brutal economic realities of the 1930s left their mark on the people and landscape of West Oakland. A virtual standstill in the construction and capital-goods industries in the early 1930s hit shipyards, machine shops and metal works, and the building trades. Severe cutbacks by the SPRR kept the company solvent, unlike many American railroads during those hard times, but a large number of jobs were lost, and those workers who did stay on the company rolls often had very limited employment. Less affected were the Point’s consumer goods manufacturers, such as the canneries and other food processors. Although employed, the unskilled labor at such firms would have suffered from the overall Depression-era reduction in wages. The construction of the Bay Bridge between 1933 and 1936 must surely have provided employment and increased business for some West Oakland residents, but its completion set in motion changes that would radically alter the character of the transportation-driven community.

As the western rail terminus for the SPRR system, West Oakland received its share of down-and-out Dust Bowl refugees, many of whom arrived penniless on the freight cars. Various “hobo jungles” or camps sprang up in the area, including “Pipe City,” a village of inhabited large concrete sewer pipes along the tracks on the waterfront. The unemployed could eat at church or government soup kitchens, or buy a large bag of broken cookies for a nickel, at a factory near Fourth and Adeline Streets (Sappers 1993). This period may have contributed to a decline in the Point’s traditional ethnic harmony: “One old-time German-American West Oaklander...blamed the Depression for the end of an era when ‘West Oakland was everybody,’ saying that ‘Okies and Arkies brought Jim Crow in’” (OCHS 1990 [2]:53). Besides documenting a perceptible deterioration in black/white relations, the statement also displays a resentment of the then-newest arrivals, characterized as “Okies and Arkies” by some older residents.

By the late 1930s, West Oakland’s built environment was showing the stress of the Depression. Financially strapped working- and middle-class householders were concerned with survival, and house upkeep was not as much of a priority as in better times. This lack of resources for maintenance, combined with the advancing age of most of the houses, contributed to a general degrading of the neighborhoods. While the Seventh Street commercial corridor still preserved a fairly prosperous appearance, residential areas began to grow seedy with neglect. The attention of social planners turned to West Oakland, and at the end of the decade, several blocks in the center of the community were condemned as a “slum” and their houses were bulldozed out of the way. Replacing the homes in 1941 was the barracks-like Peralta Village, one of California’s first public-housing projects. In 1942 the once-grand McDermott Estate, the last large chunk of green space in West Oakland, was also razed for a housing project. Both were used for housing mostly newly arrived war-industries workers. The definition of portions of the community as slums did little to instill civic pride in the remaining homeowners.

World War II brought increased shipbuilding and the construction of the huge Oakland Army Base and the Naval Supply Center on filled tidelands. War-industry jobs did improve prosperity, but while bolstering West Oakland’s economy to a degree, the new military installations were essentially stand-alone entities. Spatially separate, they did not integrate much with the community, nor substantially boost commerce on the Seventh Street business strip, which was suffering from the bridge-induced shutdown of the auto ferries and, in 1941, the discontinuance of the Red Trains. Many of those West Oaklanders who had done well during the war moved away afterward to a better life in the suburbs.
WORKERS' HOMES IN WEST OAKLAND

adapted from Olmsted and Olmsted (1994) by Robert Douglass

West Oakland neighborhoods were somewhat mixed economically, but ranged from working class to middle class in general character. Wealthier (middle-to upper-middle-class) residents, as a rule, tended to live farther away from the railroad yards and freight lines. Working-class housing was often smaller and inwardly focused, with fewer concessions to architectural fashion and social rules than middle-class housing. Yards were fenced and often used for practical purposes. As part of the Cypress Archaeology Project, two general types of workers’ houses have been proposed: the Informal workers’ cottage and the Almost-polite house (Groth and Gutman 1997). The first tends to have plain exteriors, well-utilized porches and yards, and minimally specialized rooms. The latter, grading more toward middle-class ideals, features decorated façades and organized interiors comprising single-purpose rooms.

The 1931 photograph reproduced here shows a row of working-class housing one block south of the project area’s Block 5 at Third and Filbert streets. The buildings all appear on the 1889 Sanborn insurance map (Sanborn Map Company 1889). Although the second house contains two flats (note the double entry doors), and the third is a duplex (the two identical gabled fronts are actually wings of a single building), these homes all seem to fall within the range of the Informal workers’ cottage style. The yards are all fenced, and a small utilitarian garage has been tacked on the second house with little regard for appearance. Since the houses date at least to the 1880s, they were likely to have originally had backyard outhouses, but by the time of the photograph, back-porch toilets were the norm. While the neighborhood looks clean and neat, it appears that most of the houses are in need of paint: this probably reflects the hard times of the growing Depression.

Typical West Oakland houses at Third and Filbert streets in 1931. (Photo reproduced with permission from Vernon J. Sappers)
SINCE THE WAR: CONTINUING CHANGE IN WEST OAKLAND

America was changing the way it traveled and moved goods. West Oakland’s fortunes had been tied to transportation from the beginning. First the automobile ferries, then the construction of the Bay Bridge, then the demise of the interurban electrics, signaled the shift from rails to highways that would change the face of the community. The age of the railroads was in recession, and the dieselizeation of the main-line locomotives from 1950 to 1956, with its lower maintenance and increased use of standardized parts, made the SPRR’s extensive Oakland yards largely obsolete. The facility was essentially shut down in the late 1950s, its roundhouse demolished, and employees reduced to a skeleton crew of diesel mechanics. The Oakland Mole lingered, deserted and ghostlike, until its 1960 demolition. Trains leaving Oakland dropped from 40 per day in the early 1950s to 3 at the end of the 1960s.

As the system of freeways grew around the Bay Area and the rest of the nation, the original Cypress Freeway was designed as an efficient connector between the Bay Bridge and the Nimitz Freeway. It was completed in 1957, resulting in the demolition of buildings on Blocks 1 through 11 and physically dividing West Oakland. At the same time, as the de facto western limit of area “slum clearance,” it acted to partially protect the neighborhoods between it and the bay. Urban planners of the late 1960s and early 1970s, attempting to demonstrate inclusiveness toward a disadvantaged community, imposed a massive Post Office facility on the neighborhood and ran the new, elevated BART line up Seventh Street. The Post Office and its parking lots destroyed six blocks of Bayview Tract houses from the 1870s and 1880s, and the new BART station and its parking lot cleared several more blocks, while elevated BART tracks assaulted the remaining integrity of the historic Seventh Street corridor.

On the eve of the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake, West Oakland had suffered through years of economic decline. Unemployment averaged 21.5 percent, and with a median income of $13,123.00, more than 35 percent of area residents lived below poverty level. It was a community of renters: only 15 percent of the district’s 8,735 housing units were owner-occupied. The ethnic mix had come to include a majority of African Americans (77.3%), with Euroamericans (11%), Hispanics (5.7%), Asians and Pacific Islanders (3.5%), and Native Americans (0.3%) making up most of the rest (Caltrans 2002:3-4). Although the Port of Oakland continued to play a vital part in America’s economy and required a large work force, relatively few Point residents worked there then or now. After the Cypress structure collapsed, activists insisted on avoiding past mistakes and eager to improve and revitalize the once-thriving community, succeeded in working with Caltrans to move the alignment of the rebuilt Cypress to the current project area.

As it always has been, West Oakland today remains a vibrant neighborhood. There are, to be sure, many problems still facing its people. Some positive changes are resulting from the quake tragedy, in the Point’s identity and landscape. A renewed awareness of past and place are directing movement into the future, as residents become reacquainted with local history, property owners restore 19th-century houses, and developers build new housing with a fresh sense of historical perspective.
CHAPTER 3

CONSUMERISM, LIVING CONDITIONS, AND MATERIAL WELL-BEING

ADRIAN PRAETZELLIS

In general, life is better than it has ever been, and if you think that, in the past, there was some golden age of pleasure and plenty to which you would, if you were able, transport yourself, let me say one single word: Dentistry

P.J. O’Rourke

The story of 19th-century America is one of urbanization, industrialization, and the cultural changes that accompanied these processes. In 1850 a mere 15 percent of the U.S. population lived in towns; in 1900 the proportion had grown to 40 percent. At the same time, immigration was, quite literally, changing the face of the nation. By the late 19th century, the result was a nation of teeming urban centers populated in large number by people who were separated by only one generation from traditional rural cultures in both the United States and Europe.

These were the precursors to modern Americans, and their experiences have helped to shape contemporary American values and mores (Figure 3.1). By studying them we can better understand the present. The process by which these immigrants adapted to and were affected by life in industrialized America is one of the most important issues in American history. By the same token, the essential role of artifacts (both manufactured and incidental) is an important theme in the era’s historical archaeology (Gutman 1977; Teague 1987). The process was, of course, very complex and some aspects of it are less amenable to a primarily archaeological study than others. The guiding tenet of this study, however, is that artifacts are material culture; as aspects of culture, they can only be understood within a behavioral and historic context. The Cypress collection is particularly well suited to this approach because the assemblages of which it is composed are derived from segments of the population of known demographic and ethnic character.

This chapter is a fairly straightforward study of the evidence relating to the material well-being of various West Oakland populations, as exemplified by particular clusters of households. We are using the term “well-being” to cover two of the material aspects of life that contribute to the feeling of comfort and satisfaction: consumer goods and health and nutrition. The skeptical reader should not infer that we consider these characteristics to be the sole determinants of either contentment or feelings of relative deprivation. They are, however, aspects of life that have fairly unambiguous material correlates; they are therefore quite accessible to archaeological analysis through which we can get at the material outcomes of 19th-century consumerism and the way social differences may or may not have been expressed and reinforced by various segments of the population. The short essays in this chapter touch on various aspects of consumer goods, including clothing, patent medicine, ceramics, the influence of spiritual teaching and advertising on consumer practices, and some of the consumer choices made by immigrant Jews. The main essay explores the topic of health and nutrition using statistical analyses of faunal remains.
CONSUMER GOODS

The 19th century saw the coming together of both a desire to acquire material possessions and the ability to do so on a massive scale. This was scarcely a coincidence, for the consumerism of the era was fueled by the availability of commodities and a system of social values that encouraged their purchase, what Karl Marx termed commodity fetishism. But the use of these concepts requires some explanation. By commodity, we mean something that is produced for the purpose of exchange. In modern times, this exchange is mediated by money. Commodities are made for their exchange value, rather than their use value—they are not created for what they can do but for what their maker can receive for them in exchange (Marx 1978 [1867]). Historical archaeologists retrieve commodities in the form of objects used for household decoration and display, as well as items of personal adornment. By consumerism, we mean that preoccupation with the acquisition of goods created and distributed en masse for that purpose. McKendrick (1982) sees the origins of consumerism in the 18th century, but it is in the 19th century where we see its florescence in the ready availability of a vast range of items heretofore available only to the wealthy.

Luxury items, however, should not be thought of in contrast to necessities, as if the latter have more veracity than the former. Appadurai points out that so-called luxuries are simply “goods whose principal use is rhetorical and social, goods that are incarnated signs” rather than having a utilitarian function (1986:38). The special status of these goods is socially assigned on the basis of (among other criteria) their cost, difficulty of acquisition, and the specialized knowledge necessary to employ them effectively (Appadurai 1986:32-38). The latter is of particular interest, in that fashion is seen as the mainspring of material change in a consumer society (Bell 1976). The significance
of these insights will emerge as we investigate the role of food, particularly meat, in our households’ visions of themselves.

Although the individual experiences it as desire, consumer demand does not originate with the individual but from external forces such as advertising and social pressure; it is a change in the idiom (fashion) that causes a change in demand. Paul Shackel (1998) noted many examples of the discard of consumer artifacts en masse around the turn of the 18th century. Although archaeologists have explained these episodes individually by everything from demographic transitions to ideological change, Shackel believes that the overriding pattern of disposal is a function of the value given to constant replacement within a consumption-oriented society. This interpretation harks back to Veblen’s (1899) study of the consumption patterns of 19th-century middle-class Americans, in which he demonstrated how social value was assigned to the constant acquisition and rapid relinquishment of luxury commodities. The tastemakers of the Victorian era were surely working overtime.

A topic of interest to archaeologists in recent years has been the investigation of the degree to which social identity has increasingly been defined by consumption patterns. Much of this work seeks to use the quantity and nature of consumer goods principally as indicators of social class and wealth: since more affluent people could have bought more expensive goods, the archaeological expression of wealth is in the presence of expensive artifacts. Although this logic is seemingly unassailable, LouAnn Wurst and Randy McGuire have roundly criticized the approach, for its emphasis on the individual as an autonomous agent. “The issue,” they point out, “is not what people buy, but the social relations that enable and constrain what they buy” (Wurst and McGuire 1999:196). To this, we might add a critique of the commodity fetishism of archaeologists, who have been keener to study the idiom—the artifacts themselves—than the processes that created these objects and put them into the houses of our forebears.

Historical archaeology is not the history of artifacts. On their own these materials are unimportant, except as mementos. Their importance is in their ability to elucidate important themes in American history and culture change. From this perspective, the issue is not of mere academic interest but one through which we can obtain important insights into contemporary society. By documenting consumerism as a process created in a particular era out of identifiable social conditions, we emphasize that it is not a natural and timeless feature of human existence but a creation of our modern economic system and modern sensibilities. Nineteenth-century people were no more naïve or easily manipulated than we. The idiom has changed—laptop computers and SUVs have replaced the sumptuous wardrobe and tastefully decorated parlor—but the process is surely continuing at as rapid a pace now, with global implications for both the exploitation of workers from the industrializing world and the degradation of the global environment.

**Selling the Christmas Spirit: The Creation of a Consumer Holiday**

*Annita Waghorn*

Of all the American holidays, Christmas bears the greatest weight of custom, expectation, and ambivalence. Even secular and non-Christian Americans know, as if by instinct, what a proper Christmas should be: It’s about family, gifts, food, indulgence, and charity. For many, the religious meaning of the holiday—the birth of humanity’s savior, Jesus Christ—is little more than a sweet story. This is the modern Christmas and, like many traditions, part of its appeal is its deeply familiar and ageless feel. Yet these traditions are little more than a century old. The
roots of the modern Christmas lie in 19th-century efforts to domesticate a festival with strong pre-Christian origins and, coincidentally, to harness its emotional potential to fuel the American industrial and commercial machine.

Until the mid-1900s, mid-winter celebrations in America centered not on Christmas but on New Year’s Day, when the winter solstice was celebrated (Schmidt 1995:109). And it was primarily a communal celebration marked by visiting between friends, drinking, public rowdiness, and a mild anarchy that expressed relief and anticipation as winter began its slow turn towards spring (Nissenbaum 1997:90). Christmas, one week earlier, was primarily a quiet religious event.

The 1820s saw the rise of two movements that would eventually coalesce to shape the modern Christmas rite. To combat the communal, lower-class associations of an alcohol-fueled New Year celebration, temperance reformers and their supporters sought to develop Christmas as an alternative holiday that focused instead on children, the family, and the home (Nissenbaum 1997:95). They did this by progressively distancing and contrasting the celebration of the two holidays, praising the home-centered Christmas while disparaging the rowdy public celebrations of New Year. Special food and decorations that transformed the home into a setting focused on Christmas were also promoted (Figure 3.2). At the same time, manufacturers and storeowners began to appreciate the commercial potential of religious celebrations such as Christmas and Easter. Creating new markets for goods, particularly those of a nonessential nature, became increasingly important during the 19th century, as the new efficiencies and machinery of American industry began to outstrip demand for basic products (Schmidt 1995:32). Christmas was fertile ground for the spirit of enterprise.

Although manufactured presents had been advertised since the early 1800s, before the mid-century gifts tended to be practical, handmade, and unwrapped tokens given to family not at Christmas, but on New Year’s Day (Nissenbaum 1997:136; Waits 1993:16). Much effort towards the reinvention of Christmas was concentrated on shifting the custom of gift-giving from New Year’s to Christmas. The promotion of Christmas as a family holiday with children at its center eased the adoption of the festival as the most appropriate time for exchanging gifts, especially between family members. The expectations around gifts themselves also began to grow as the character of a gift was increasingly seen to be symbolic of the value placed by the giver on the relationship with the recipient (Waits 1993:34).

Even as consumer-oriented culture was picking up steam, Victorian Americans continued to feel a deep unease with purchasing gifts and so attaching a monetary value to relationships. The exchange of money necessary to

![Figure 3.2. A Christmas garland, ca. 1882. These glass beads would have been strung in a garland to decorate the William Long house at Christmas. A butcher from Germany, Long and his wife soon moved on to a finer home; they left additional evidence of good cheer at the holiday season, including fine tableware and 13 alcoholic beverage bottles (Privy 156).](image-url)
purchase a manufactured gift somehow tainted the item with the crass values of the market place. For this reason, and despite the steady growth in advertisements for manufactured Christmas presents after the 1820s, many people persisted in feeling that handmade items were best since they represented an investment of one’s own time and labor, and were personalized for the recipient.

Storeowners and manufacturers were quick to recognize the roots of this resistance to the manufactured, purchased gift, and moved to “sanitize” prospective gifts of their marketplace associations. These ingenious techniques included the sale of semi-finished items, such as handkerchief squares or blank cards, that allowed the purchaser to contribute enough finishing work to qualify them as handmade gifts (Waits 1993:18, 21, 23, 27). Semi-finished gifts reflected the tension felt by many people in their transition from a pre-modern agricultural-based economy to the urbanized consumerist culture of the late 19th century (Waits 1993). Not surprisingly, the popularity of semi-finished items as gifts declined in the early 20th century, as Americans grew more comfortable with the consumer culture and the unmodulated link between money and personal relationships through purchased gifts.

Other tricks used to ease the transformation from goods to gifts involved selling items ready-wrapped and by claiming that items had been especially manufactured for Christmas giving. The most successful technique of all, however, was to use symbolic intermediaries to distance commercialism from the process of giving. The most successful of these is Santa Claus who, a descendent of the historical figures of Saint Nicholas and Kris Kringle, was adopted by 1880s advertisers as an appealing way to link the values of the personalized and the handmade to factory-produced items.

The domesticated commercial Christmas was in full swing by the 1880s and was readily embraced in growing cities like Oakland (Figure 3.3). December newspapers of the 1880s and 1890s contained pages of Christmas advertisements, and the holiday became a financial lynchpin of the Oakland commercial year: civic leaders in 1888 expressed satisfaction that poor weather would persuade many locals to patronize Oakland’s stores rather than taking their valued Christmas business across the bay to San Francisco (Oakland Enquirer 22 December 1888).

Oakland storekeepers encouraged the practice of Christmas giving by presenting small tokens to their customers. Several items from the Cypress archaeological collection attest to these efforts to promote the commercial Christmas: a small plastic and metal button dating from pre-1906 and found in refuse left by the Bankhead family at 812 Market Street advertises the Oakland store of Salingers, with an image of a jolly Santa Claus. More evidence of the attempts to associate gifts, indulgences in food and drink, and the Christmas spirit was a glass alcohol flask from the privy of the Holderer family at 793 Wood Street, emblazoned with “Christmas ’93” (Figure 3.4).
One outcome of the commercialization of Christmas and Easter was to provide the young American nation with a set of unifying traditions. At a time when westward expansion and large-scale immigration was contributing to the development of distinct cultural regions within the country, the rituals of the commercialized holidays created shared secular traditions and experiences (Schmidt 1995:33). The drive to transform these holidays met with some resistance, for a theme of anti-consumerism ran through late 19th-century Victorian culture, although it has largely been obscured by the stereotype of Victorians as enthusiastic consumers. Drawing on republican-era suspicions of the corrupting influence of great wealth, anti-consumerists objected to the conspicuous display demanded by the developing culture (Barton 1989:61). As sociologist Edward Alsworth Ross thundered in 1909, it was a threat to the democratic basis for American society: “The rich are gangrened with pride, the poor with envy. Unless democracy mends the distribution of wealth, the mal-distribution of wealth will end democracy” (quoted in Barton 1989:58).

The late-Victorian Christmas, with its emphasis on an ever-lengthening shopping season and more numerous and expensive gifts, was a prime target for the anti-materialist movement. Many middle-class women, who were increasingly responsible for the family’s Christmas preparations, betrayed their ambivalence towards the demands of the consumer Christmas in their diaries, writing of the exhaustion and sense of reluctant duty that had begun to taint the season (Schmidt 1995:154-157). The consumer Christmas, however, rolled inexorably onward. We modern Americans are its inheritors and willingly (or not) participate in the annual ritual of presents, gift-wrap, and general excess that hits the malls the day after the Thanksgiving turkey decorations come down.

THE SPECTER OF SPIRITUALISM IN OAKLAND

Michael Meyer

In 1848 when gold was discovered in California, the most powerful religious influence in the eastern United States was evangelicalism. This revivalistic Protestant movement encompassed the Baptist, Congregational, Disciples of Christ, Methodist, and Presbyterian denominations, as well as a variety of small sects, and stood in opposition to Roman Catholicism, the predominant religion of Spanish California (Frankiel 1988:ix). That same year, on the eve of the Gold Rush, the Spiritualist movement in America was also beginning (Doyle 1926:11).

As Argonauts from around the world streamed into California, the Roman Catholic Church lost its hold on California and ties to established, East Coast evangelical institutions were broken as well. The California Gold Rush was unique, as poor men with limited capital were able to extract wealth from public lands and reinvent themselves. This model fit well with the Spiritualist belief in life after death and of spiritual growth and completion (Frankiel 1988:34-35).
Laurentine Hamilton, an Oakland Presbyterian minister, gave a series of sermons in 1868 that rejected the idea of eternal damnation. His church accused him of heresy. Yet for Spiritualists, this idea was at the core of their progressive ideology that had begun with abolition and embraced women’s suffrage, health reform, marriage reform or “free love,” children’s rights, labor reform, dress reform, vegetarianism, temperance, utopianism, and, above all, religious reform (Braude 1989:3, 125-129; Kerr 1972:11).

As they lacked a conventional organizational structure, the Spiritualists kept few records and the total number of active participants is unknown. The first lectures on Spiritualism in San Francisco were presented in 1859 (Schlesinger 1896). Spiritualist newspapers were published in cities throughout the country; the Carrier Dove was originally published in Oakland and later in San Francisco. By 1890 three Spiritualist journals were published in California (Carrier Dove 1890:261). Two Spiritualist state conventions were held in Oakland during the 1880s, and meetings were held each Thursday evening at Curtis Hall on the city block bounded by Brush/Fifth/Sixth/Market streets (Carrier Dove 1886:302)—what would become Block 3 of the Cypress Archaeology Project.

Marshall Curtis moved to Oakland soon after he arrived in California from Massachusetts in 1853. City directories of the early 1870s listed him as a land agent or in real estate. By 1862 Curtis owned all of Block 3 and was probably the first private owner (Oakland Enquirer 28 June 1889). He later owned the opposite Sixth Street block frontage and was also partner in the Curtis Williams tract further north, where Curtis and Lydia (his wife) streets are located.

Curtis made his money through real estate, a favored investment of capitalists and speculators at the time. By 1878 he had changed his occupation listed in city directories to “proprietor of Liberty Hall” and “magnetic physician” (Oakland City Directories: v.d.). Marshall Curtis was one of the most prominent Spiritualists in the city. His listing as a “magnetic physician” was synonymous with Spiritualism (Armstrong 1991). Liberty Hall was located at 835 Brush Street, north of Block 3, and was listed in the directories from 1875 to 1879. Like many similar buildings throughout Oakland, it was available to rent for private functions. Curtis Hall, at 767 Sixth Street on Block 3, was similarly listed in 1887. According to the Carrier Dove:

‘Father Curtis’ has erected, near Market-street Station, a pleasant, commodious hall, the use of which is given free for all Spiritual services, and at which place Mr. Ravlin will hold meetings on Thursday of each week. These meetings, we understand, are to be of the nature of social reunions, and will prove exceedingly entertaining and pleasant [1886:302].

The meetings at Curtis Hall likely attracted Flora London, Jack London’s mother. In such a small community, Flora was probably acquainted with Marshall Curtis, although her endeavors into the spiritual world were less benevolent. A biographical sketch speaks of her, own efforts as a medium:

The rearing of young Johnny London was left to his stepsisters and his stepfather, who was devoted to his adopted son. Flora increasingly spent her time thinking of schemes to raise the family above its working class status - and holding séances in which she served the medium for an ‘Indian Chief’ called ‘Plume’ who spoke from the ‘Spirit World’ [Herron 1985:184].

In 1887 the London family lived at 807 Pine Street, on Cypress Block 20; at another time they were much closer to Curtis Hall, at Seventh and Adeline, on or near Cypress Block 9.
To the Spiritualists, Marshall Curtis was known as “Father Curtis.” His obituaries in the Carrier Dove and the Oakland Enquirer both gave testimony to his devotion. The very presence of Curtis Hall was significant considering that in 1890 the San Francisco Spiritualists were without a temple of their own although the meetings there were larger than those in East Coast cities (Carrier Dove 1890:261). Curtis’s obituary in the Oakland Enquirer stated that “...about ten years ago he was partially paralyzed and has since been compelled to get about on crutches, but seldom went further than Market street station” (28 July 1889); he had previously owned much of the property at Market Street Station, a block from his home (Figure 3.5).

After Curtis died, his house lot at the corner of West and Sixth streets was sold to William J. Laymance, bookkeeper for a real-estate and auction firm with offices in San Francisco, as well as Oakland. The Laymance-Curtis connection extended beyond real estate, however, for Laymance also advertised in the Carrier Dove (1886:310).

After its owner’s death, Curtis Hall became first the Swedish Mission Church and, for a short time, the Ebeneezer Baptist church, with an African American congregation.

Privy 1785 on Cypress Block 3 was filled when Curtis was developing the site and building a new home for himself at the corner of Sixth and West (Market) streets in 1874. The archaeological remains provided few insights into the Spiritualist beliefs of Curtis and his family. The material representation of his beliefs is found on a much larger scale.

The construction of the transcontinental railroad terminus in Oakland some years before increased the value of the Curtis real-estate holdings. Curtis was one of the lucky landowners who saw their property values rise with construction of the Oakland and San Francisco Railroad, as well as the Central Pacific. Although he did not become exceedingly wealthy, Curtis was able to construct a new house and leave a sizable estate for his sons. Although it appears that Curtis was able to live off of his investments like a capitalist, he did not see himself in these terms.

By building Curtis Hall for the purpose of holding religious meetings, Curtis showed that he was, first and foremost, a Spiritualist, with that group’s ambivalence toward the era’s materialism. Julia Schlesinger’s 1896 address, titled “Practical Spiritualism,” expressed these anti-capitalist values:
Error is sitting in high places, clothed in the royal vestments of power, while truth—sweet, loving, beautiful, truth—goes naked through the world. Greed and avarice are piling up their shining millions, while honor and virtue are starving in cellars and attics. Vice and idleness are arrayed in fine linen and purple, faring sumptuously every day, while honest labor is clothed in rags, and goes begging for its just dues. The debauchee, who glorifies in the spoilage of innocence and virtue, is pampered and petted, feasted and praised, while his helpless and hapless victim is doomed to a life of shame and disgrace . . . See that your own life is pure, that your motives are unselfish, that your souls are full of love and charity for all humanity. Never lose an opportunity of saying a kind word, or reaching out a helping hand to any unfortunate struggling in the depths of despair, even though his own wrong-doing may have been the cause of his desolation and distress [1896:260].

The same publication contained “The Creed of Spiritualists,” in which the author, J.W. Reynolds, M.D., opined, “Every person is under a moral obligation to prevent poverty by working for the enhancement of laws for the just distribution of the products of labor, and also to help the deserving to the extent of his means” (1896:81).

By comparing the family’s wealth with the remains left to us in Privy 1785, it appears that Curtis practiced these Spiritualist ideals. While their tableware and diet were above average compared with other local residents, they were not as lavish as Curtis could afford. While the family lived in a larger, more stylish house than the capitalist Benjamin Mann on Block 1, there is no evidence that that the Curtis parlor or dining room was as lavishly decorated as the Manns’ (Figure 3.6; see also Privy 900 and Privy 1785 snapshots in Appendix D).

For Victorians, “the ideal house was to be a personal statement—a symbolic representation of what the owner stood for and valued. The ideal house was to function as a vehicle for displaying the civilized nature of its inhabitants” (Clark 1896:114). With the stylish design and large bay windows of his new house at Sixth and Market, Curtis used an accepted means of display to announce his membership in the middle class. But, he chose to use the development of the entire block as a display of good moral character and spiritual values. Rather than merely displaying order in a single room, Marshall Curtis had ordered an entire block. Curtis Hall was an obvious example of this, but the development of the entire block follows the pattern.

Since Curtis developed all but one corner of the block himself, he had control over what was built. While surrounding blocks were filled with more expensive homes of more uniform size, the worker’s cottages on Fifth Street were small. Since Curtis rented and eventually sold
most of his Block 3 holdings, he could have made a larger profit by building larger homes but instead chose to create a block of diverse house sizes for people of differing means (Figure 3.7).

While Curtis had done well for himself and his family, he was true to his Spiritualist values, creating housing that reflected "just distribution of the products of labor" (Reynolds 1896:81). During the 1870s, families of tradesmen like the Taylors at 768 Fifth occupied these rental cottages, which may have provided housing close to the much larger homes—what we have dubbed Polite Victorian Houses—that they, themselves were building.

Across the street was the large home of John Wright, a successful '49er who moved his family's steamboat business from New York to San Francisco. Wright, a self-described capitalist, purchased the row of cottages from the Curtis family and must have kept a watchful eye on his investment from across the street, until selling his Fifth Street holdings and moving to the more fashionable shores of Lake Merritt.

A final example of the material expression of Curtis's values can be found in Oakland's Mountain View Cemetery. Curtis's plot is marked with an obelisk that bears names of family members who proceeded him in death, but not his own. The modest monument is a third the size of John Wright's, which stands nearby. Both the Curtis and Wright obelisks are dwarfed by the lavish tombs of city founder Edson Adams and railroad magnate Charles Crocker. Curtis's Spiritualism would never have allowed his heirs to spend a great deal of money for such an ostentatious display. For him, Curtis Hall was a far more worthwhile investment.
Out for a Stroll: The Visual Experience of a Sunday Afternoon in West Oakland

Sunshine Psota

Oaklanders enjoy an afternoon at the merry-go-round at Shellmound Park. To the right, the man with a cigar donned a cap instead of the preferred wool-felt hat chosen by the rest of the men. Dressed for an outing, most of the men wear buttoned-up vests, ties, and a suit, oftentimes a pocket watch stuck into a vest pocket. More variety of fashion and dress can be seen in what women have chosen to wear. The fashionable light-colored skirts and waists, with their full 1890s sleeve, could be set off by anything from a straightforward hat worn by the woman on the far right to a straw hat by a woman on the far left, to extremely elaborate works of art by women at center right and the far left. (Photo courtesy Oakland Public Library, Oakland History Room)

Let’s go for an imaginary walk through West Oakland in the mid-1880s.

It is a beautiful autumn afternoon. The fog is tuckered well out of sight beyond San Francisco, so the air is warm when you are in the sun. We are on Seventh Street, where everything from commerce and industry to what people are wearing is influenced by the ever-present railroad. Into this world steps an anonymous hotel manager who was hired by Mr. Frese, after his wife died, to help run the Railroad Exchange Hotel [1].

She is dressed in her Sunday best: a pink and black buffalo-plaid wool dress. Her skirt is narrow, reflecting this year’s fashion, with extra fabric gathered in the back to accentuate the full roundness of her artificially enhanced hips. The tight-fitting basque body is trimmed with small pleats and buttons; some lace softens the neckband [2]. The tight-fitting coat so restricts her movements that she must take it off to pin her hat on her head. She pauses thinking about which route to take—shall she head to the park on her afternoon off or just a saunter around the neighborhood?

Behind her, two of the male lodgers have also ducked out into the street. In contrast to her fashionable ensemble, they wear basic, wool sack coats (today called sport coats or just jackets) [3]. As lodgers, they enjoy the independence and flexibility of living in a respectable place with a night clerk and, therefore, no curfew [4]. While the rooms are compact, the neighborhood is a string of social connections and businesses where they interact daily. The men proceed on their way, perhaps for a
smoke outdoors or a visit to the hotel’s saloon next door for a drink or to chat with other Southern Pacific Railroad men. They are especially fond of the full-bodied, aromatic Cuban cigars of Colorado tobacco that the saloon usually has available to be inhaled in the company of friends [5].

Acknowledging them with a bob of her head, the woman strolls east on Seventh one block, turning left onto Cedar, and walks smartly across Goss Street. Here she passes the home of Ellen McLaughlin and her family, one of four houses on this side of the street. Although our stroller doesn’t know the young woman’s name, even in a group of her childhood friends, Ellen stands out as a smart dresser with an eye for the most current fashions. A dressmaker, Ellen wears a dress she fashioned from brown silk with fancy woven stripes, accessorized with a piece of inexpensive jewelry and her high-laced street shoes with fashionable sculptured heels [6]. In her business it is important to have a stylish dress that shows off both her assets and her abilities.

Throughout the neighborhoods, West Oaklanders are coming out of their homes and onto the streets, escaping their daily demands for a little while to socialize on this fine afternoon. Over on Fifth Street east of Market, Eunice Mann, Fredrick’s much-younger widow, has on her black silk dress. Walking slowly next to her teenage son, Fredrick Jr., the light catches the somber dress, highlighting the intricately woven floral design. The widow made these mourning clothes on a sewing machine. She had sewn the details, such as gathering and other touches, by hand while sitting next to the bedside of her poor sick brother-in-law, Benjamin; a welcome respite from his daily care [7]. While she takes her Sunday walk, Mrs. Mann’s two youngest daughters will look after their uncle. As she walks, she acknowledges with a nod her well-dressed neighbors Mrs. Lucinda Tilghman and Abraham Holland. The sun reflects off Abraham’s gold cuff links as he tilts his hat her way. The buttons, earrings, and gold pendant worn by Lucinda catch her eye. It is a sweet, heart-shaped pendant encircled with blue-glass beads [8].

In contrast to these well-dressed Sunday walkers are the Patrick Barry family, who live several blocks away on Linden. As Patrick is a worker for the Southern Pacific Railroad, they have a more modest budget for dressing, but still appear quite presentable by West Oakland’s fashion standards. As the family prepares to go for their after-dinner stroll, Mr. Barry is wearing a comfortable herringbone-twill jacket while his wife,
Ellen, must decide between a black basket-weave jacket of wool and silk or her brown-wool, fitted basque with decorative black-glass buttons [9].

Strolling is as much a social event as it is exercise. Seeing and being seen by neighbors, business associates, and others keeps up social contacts with little interactions. In this street scene, the women and children are a sea of colors, fabrics, and patterns, with different textures and sounds, including the rustling of silk as women walked. Bustles had returned to fashion in 1883, reaching their height and breadth in 1886, and then deflating over the next few years [10]. Fans and parasols were popular accessories. Recently introduced alkali dyes splashed strong colors on gaily dressed women in this urban landscape.

Men in the 1880s, as today, tend to be visually homogeneous. Their clothing at the time of our stroll was influenced by the change from handmade to the standardization of the new ready-to-wear garments. The uniform varies little: each man dons a wool-felt hat and saunters around in wool trousers, vests, and sack coats. Black or brown are the most popular colors, with the occasional stripe, check, or tweed for casual wear. While styles did change with the years, they are far more subtle than those configured for women or children. For most working men, this meant that the suit you were married in became your Sunday best until it wore out or became so out of style that it attracted comment. Some of the common fashions seem timeless—like uncreased trousers. Other trends were subtle, as sack coats became shorter and narrower in fit. The trend in the 1870s to wear sack coats with only the top chest-height button fastened led, in the 1880s, to more buttons with a shorter lapel for a higher buttoned look. Then the top three or four buttons are buttoned, with the lower opening showing off the bottom of the vest and displaying a pocketwatch.

Our hotel manager quietly notes all the fashions of the neighborhood women, while keeping her eye on the neighborhood men and children. Generally, she notices, the older a person is, the more conservatively they dress. So while they never appear to be noticeably out of style, their clothes are never that fashionable. Younger people seem more concerned with keeping up with the changing fashion trends. The unmarried are usually the nattiest dressers, for most will have a job and be semi-independent for the first time in their life, and most are either entering or well-entrenched in the search for a mate.

Jack London summed up the situation in *The Valley of the Moon*: the number of shoes a woman had spoke eloquently of her life. Beautiful 24-year-old Saxon, London’s main character, has dated several men but is not yet engaged. Working six days a week, she often goes out to dance on work nights and weekends. She makes many of her clothes and is very concerned with her appearance on these outings. Her sister-in-law, Sarah, complains about Saxon’s behavior: why should she have new silk stockings and three pairs of shoes; poor Sarah can only afford cheap cotton stockings and one pair of shoes in decidedly bad shape [11]. While Saxon focuses only on herself, Sarah cares for the needs of her husband and children before her own vanity. The number of shoes seems so extravagant that the difference in their clothes is not even discussed.

On her way home, the new manager saunters by the Pullman Hotel to have a peek at the competition. Just a block away from the Railroad Exchange Hotel where she works, it doesn’t appear quite as nice, though the lodgers, all railroad men, look about the same [12]. She looks away, distracted by the passing of a train down the middle of Seventh Street, and now she is back at the hotel, ready to settle down to the latest edition of *Butterick’s Delineator, A Journal of Fashion, Culture and Fine Arts*. What would the experts have to say about next season’s fashions?

Strolling boot. This well-preserved, high-laced boot was recovered from the Railroad Exchange Hotel on Seventh Street, where dozens of clothing items were identified. An example of good-quality woman’s footwear, it was just the thing to wear when sauntering through the neighborhood (Well 4600).
Sources for "Out for a Stroll":

1. Information on the Railroad Exchange Hotel and Mr. Frese comes from Tax Rolls (1862-1866), City Directories (1869-1888), Block Books (1877-1887), U.S Census (1870, 1880), and M.W. Wood's *History of Alameda County*, 1883. This information is presented on the Documentary Research Table (DRT) on pp. 168-170 of *Block Technical Report: Historical Archaeology 1-880 Cypress Replacement Project: Blocks 22, 24, and 29*, edited by Mary Praetzelis and Suzanne B. Stewart, 2001, prepared for the California Department of Transportation (hereafter referred to as Block 29 BTR). According to the census information, Mrs. Frese died between 1870 and 1880.

2. The description of the hotel manager's attire is based upon the remains of fabric, buttons, and jewelry found in the Railroad Exchange Hotel well (4600). A portion of the well extended below the water table, which resulted in the excellent preservation of fabric and other fragile artifact types that generally do not survive in archaeological contexts. The clothing remains are described in the Feature Summary (pp. 172-173) and tabulated on the Artifact Descriptive List (pp. 180-190) of the Block 29 BTR.

3. Remains of men's clothing were also recovered from Well 4600. A suit and hat are pictured on p. 172 of the Block 29 BTR, while the remains themselves are described and tabulated on pp. 172-173 and 180-190 of the BTR, respectively.


5. The Railroad Exchange Hotel had a bar from its inception, as shown by John Frese's 1863 tax assessment for bar fixtures. Twenty-one cigar boxes were recovered from the hotel's well, including some marked “El Aguila de Koeniggraetz/A. Bacallao C.M. Havana,” “Flora Fina,” and Flora de Loro”; see DRT and Artifact Descriptive List of the Block 29 BTR. The smoking assemblage from the Railroad Exchange Hotel is shown in Figure 9.9, this volume.

6. Archaeologists excavated a series of deposits associated with Ellen McLaughlin's family at 881 Cedar Street on Cypress Block 27. These features are discussed in *Block Technical Report: Historical Archaeology 1-880 Cypress Replacement Project: Blocks 27, 28, and 31*, edited by Mary Praetzelis, pp. 50-107, 2001, prepared for the California Department of Transportation (hereafter referred to as Block 27 BTR). The 1880 U.S. Census listed 18-year-old Ellen as a dressmaker; see DRT, pp. 53-55. Silk and woolen clothing, buttons, jewelry, a purse, and numerous items of footwear—including a pair of fashionable women's high-laced shoes—were recovered from Privy 2822; see Feature Summary and Artifact Descriptive List, pp. 69-72 and 75-80 in the Block 27 BTR.

7. The Mann family is discussed in many sections of this report and in *Block Technical Report: Historical Archaeology 1-880 Cypress Replacement Project: Block 1*, edited by Mary Praetzelis, pp. 33-63, 2001, prepared for the California Department of Transportation (hereafter referred to as Block 1 BTR). Women's silk clothing, buttons, jewelry, hair accessories, bone fans, corset fasteners, shoes, slippers, and a sewing-machine-oil bottle were recovered from Privy 900 associated with the Mann family. These items are described in the Feature Summary and listed on the Artifact Descriptive List, pp. 39-41 and 45-52 of the Block 1 BTR.
Sources for "Out for a Stroll": (continued)

8. The household of Lucinda Tilghman and Abraham Holland was just a few doors down from the Mann family on Block 1. Their collection was remarkable for the number of gold items. These are described in the Feature Summary and listed on the Artifact Descriptive List, pp. 85-86 and 90-95 of the Block 1 BTR. Some of their items are pictured in Figure 3.9.

9. The Barry family lived in a small residence divided into flats on Linden Street. Their privy is discussed in Block Technical Report: Historical Archaeology I-880 Cypress Replacement Project: Blocks 4, 5, 6, and 9, edited by Mary Praetzellis and Suzanne B. Stewart, pp. 415-440, 2001, prepared for the California Department of Transportation (hereafter referred to as Block 6 BTR). Men’s and women’s clothing, buttons, jewelry, eyeglasses, and a corset fastener were recovered; these are described in the Feature Summary and listed on the Artifact Descriptive List, pp. 419-420 and 425-431 of the Block 6 BTR.

10. Historical photographs, such as the accompanying one of Shellmound Park in nearby Emeryville, are a good source for tracing changing fashions. See Joan Severa, Dressed for the Photographer: Ordinary Americans and Fashion, 1840-1900, 1995.

11. Jack London had an excellent eye for detail, including women’s fashions. His young heroine, Saxon, knew how to dress for her nights out and how to attract the attention of the man she fancied: she bought another pair of silk stockings and made a new dress. Saxon’s troubles with her sister-in-law over her extravagances are covered in the first 10 chapters of The Valley of the Moon, 1913.

12. Archaeologists also excavated a well associated with the Pullman Hotel at 1802-1808 Seventh Street; these data are presented in Block Technical Report: Historical Archaeology I-880 Cypress Replacement Project: Blocks 22, 24, and 29, edited by Mary Praetzellis and Suzanne B. Stewart, 2001, prepared for the California Department of Transportation (hereafter referred to as Block 24 BTR). The Pullman Hotel is discussed on pp. 93-126 of the Block 24 BTR. Although both the Railroad Exchange and Pullman Hotel were among the better and probably more expensive of the third-rank hotels in West Oakland, according to the categories developed by Paul Groth (1994), the Railroad Exchange generally appears the more upscale of the two.
REBEKAH-AT-THE-WELL: A 19TH-CENTURY ICON

Toni F. Douglass

The age-old, biblical story of Rebekah at the well describes the quest of Abraham’s servant for a proper wife for Isaac, his master’s son. The mission leads him to a distant village, where Rebekah offers to draw water both for the servant and his camels. This gesture is the sign he has been looking for, and the beautiful girl is instantly chosen to be Isaac’s wife. Her hospitality is surely the reason that the image of Rebekah became so common on 19th-century ceramic wares, particularly on Rockingham-glazed teapots. By the mid-1800s, these items were being made in the tens of thousands by several pottery companies in the eastern states and may have been “the most popular piece of American pottery ever made” (Gross, Pastron, and Garaventa 1981:480-483; Stradling 1997:334).

Rockingham-glazed pottery is a “pale yellow or cream-colored earthenware covered with variegated purple-brown, brown, or yellow-brown glaze” (Praetzelis and Praetzelis 1980:14). It was first made in America in 1824 by David Henderson and George Dummer, who gave new life to the obsolete Jersey Porcelain and Pottery Works in Jersey City, renaming it the American Pottery Manufacturing Company. After four years, the partnership ended in failure and Dummer sold his share to Henderson who, joined by his brother, proceeded to “plant the seeds of modern pottery in America” (Leibowitz 1985:27). Indeed, the Hendersons’ introduction of mold-made ceramics was responsible for its transition from a cottage industry to a fully industrial production. With help from some of England’s best pottery craftsmen, Hendersons’ company produced the first yellowware and what has become known as Rockingham ware in America.

The iconic Rockingham-glazed Rebekah-at-the-Well teapot is believed to have been introduced to America by the E. and W. Bennett Pottery of Baltimore (Stradling 1997:333). Charles Coxon, a modeler for Bennett, redesigned the Rebekah image from an English stoneware pitcher in 1851 (Gross, Pastron, and Garaventa 1981:480-483). The Rebekah degree—a society for wives and daughters of members of the fraternal order of Odd Fellows—was also established in 1851. This has led some to attribute the image’s popularity to this group (Stradling 1997:335).

Rebekah-at-the-Well teapots. Found in more than one-quarter of the excavated deposits in West Oakland, among households with a range of ethnic/national ties and varied occupations, the Rebekah-at-the-Well teapots were one of the most popular pieces of pottery in the mid-19th century.

To Victorian America, the Rebekah-at-the-Well teapot was a familiar, cozy, and informal item. Its place was deep in the private center of domestic sacred space, the kitchen, itself the heart of the Victorian home. The large number of these pots found archaeologically in West Oakland demonstrates the popularity of informal tea drinking. Of the 26 contexts where these items were found, most were associated with Anglo-Americans; some were linked with households from Canada, Ireland, Scotland, Germany, and England, while two of the four African American households had also used these vessels. Many of these people worked for the railroad, including laborers, conductors, porters, a brakeman, and a fireman. Others were carpenters, a housepainter, a carpetlayer, a plumber, a paperhanger, a butcher, a bridgebuilder, a cooper, and a dressmaker. That this group of people were so occupationally diverse shows that the Rebekah-at-the-Well teapot was an icon of both Christian respectability and hospitality that crossed most class and ethnic boundaries.
**HOPE IN A MEDICINE BOTTLE**

*Maria LaCalle*

Tuberculosis, or consumption as it was popularly known, was one of the most dreaded diseases of the 19th century, being responsible for one out of every five deaths from 1800 through 1870. During the late 19th century, death rates were reduced due to medical advances and increasing public-health measures; fear of tuberculosis increased, however, as it became understood that the disease was infectious. The frightful symptoms of tuberculosis provided fuel for concern, as the unfortunate victim experienced a persistent cough—often bringing up blood, fever, night sweats, and severe loss of appetite. Consumption flourished amid the dense living-quarters of 19th-century American cities.

Mirroring the larger national problem, tuberculosis was the leading cause of death in late-19th-century Oakland, replaced only in the late 1890s by heart disease (Oakland Health Department 1916). Although Oakland had lower rates (1.7 per 1,000 in 1896) than other urban centers such as New York (3.06) or Paris (5.0) (Oakland Health Department 1897), City public-health officials considered their rates to be artificially high, for “we always have in our midst a large number of consumptives from San Francisco and other places, who have been drawn here by the mildness of our climate” (Oakland Health Department 1881:45).

German physician, Robert Koch, isolated the bacilli *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* in 1882. This discovery resulted in gradual acceptance by the medical profession that tuberculosis was not due to a hereditary predisposition, as was previously thought, but was a contagious condition that could be spread via human contact. The consequences of this discovery on medical science and public-health policy were not immediate. Physicians continued to contest the contagious nature of tuberculosis. This professional debate affected the advice that patients received. While physicians still had no effective treatment, efforts were made to improve sanitation and nutrition. Focus was placed on reducing the spread of disease and strengthening the body’s ability to defend itself against the infection. The combination of increasing numbers of consumptives and professional debate over the infectious nature of the disease created an ideal environment for patent-medicine entrepreneurs to peddle their putative “cures.”

Dr. Dunn, Oakland Health Officer, reported in 1897 that in the past the causes of tuberculosis remained unknown and few measures had been adopted to halt the spread of tuberculosis.

Now, however, we know that a bacillus of well known characteristics is always responsible for the disease, that it is always carried by certain vehicles, viz: the sputum, meat and milk and that it infects those whose systems have been brought below par, most frequently by living in illy ventilated, damp or filthy apartments, that have not been sufficiently exposed to sunlight . . . Science has, with tireless patience and sacrifice studied and finally discovered the means whereby we can become the conquerors in this formerly apparently hopeless fight with tuberculosis [Oakland Board of Health 1897: 5-6].

Dr. Dunn recommended that tuberculosis be placed on the list of contagious diseases, that patient’s quarters be disinfected, that milk be tested, that only federally inspected meat be sold, and that spitting in public places be forbidden.

Although the gradual scientific acceptance of germ theory in the late 19th century improved society’s ability to prevent tuberculosis, progress was slow in its treatment. Despite the claims of numerous patent medicines, there was no cure. However, significant gains had been made in extending
the patient’s life. “It is not uncommon,” wrote Dr. Austin Flint, a prominent figure in medical education, “to meet with instances of considerable deposit tubercle remaining quiescent or progressing very slowly and the patient able to engage in the active occupations and enjoyments of life” (Brieger 1972:142). At the same time, medical progress was opening up a new market for so-called “consumption cures,” which universally promised patients a speedy recovery. The patent-medicine business encouraged the public to bypass physicians and treat their ailments themselves (Figure 3.8). Self-medication became a big and extremely profitable business for these entrepreneurs.

In his book *Health and Disease*, Oakland surgeon Dr. C.G.R. Moutoux expressed concern regarding the vulnerability of these patients and the dubious industry that formed in order to profit from their misfortunes:

> From the time when consumption began increasing in severity, as well as in numbers of victims, many special methods have been proposed and practiced; but, after the test of experience, have been abandoned. And this will perhaps be the fate of others yet to be advanced as sure cures. But I fear that not only disappointment on the part of patients, but injurious effects on their organisms, will be the sad result—out of all proportion to the real benefits [1905:169].

![The Doctor on the Spot](Image)

Figure 3.8. The Doctor on the Spot. This book on homeopathic care was one of many such volumes that guided an “intelligent person” through home diagnosis and treatment of a family’s medical ailments. (Photo courtesy of the Oakland Museum of California)

Journalist Samuel Hopkins Adams infamously opposed the burgeoning patent-medicine industry. In his 1905 series in *Collier’s Weekly*, “The Great American Fraud,” Adams analyzed the ingredients of many of the best-selling patent medicines of the time. He reported that these companies made false claims and more importantly that, in fact, the ingredients in these nostrums often harmed those taking them. Adams’ articles single-handedly delivered a massive blow to the credibility of the industry, and ultimately led to legislative action the following year.

Several consumption “cures” were found among the numerous patent-medicine bottles excavated on the Cypress Archaeological Project. A deposit at 881 Cedar Street, home of the O’Brien family, contained the best example of self-medication among tuberculosis patients. Railroad engineer Michael O’Brien died of tuberculosis while living here in May of 1900. During his 19 months of illness, he used several proprietary medicines to ease pain and in the hopes of curing his affliction. He took cathartics—Pitcher’s Castoria, Citrate of Magnesia, and Ayer’s Pills—possibly to counteract the constipating side effects of the morphine, as well as general cure-alls: Kelly’s Bitters, Jamaica Ginger, Joy’s Sarsaparilla, and Jayne’s Tonic Vermifuge. Shiloh’s Consumption Cure seems, however, to have been Mr. O’Brien’s proprietary medicine of choice (Figure 3.9).

Michael O’Brien’s untimely death may well be testament enough as to the effectiveness of this supposed cure. Just five years after his demise, Samuel H. Adams wrote bitingly of Shiloh’s
money-back guarantee: “if I were a consumptive, after I had taken ‘Shiloh’ for awhile I should be less interested in recovering my money than in getting back my wasted chance at life” (1905:48). In the case of Mr. O’Brien, a money-back guarantee seems painfully ironic. While Mr. O’Brien may have received some relief from Shiloh’s, several of the ingredients posed as great a threat to his health as did tuberculosis.

While the chloroform in Shiloh’s Cure would have quelled O’Brien’s nagging cough, it would have also hindered his body’s way of expelling excess mucus. By the same token, as the opiates in Shiloh’s would have made him more comfortable, they un-doubtedly hastened his death by weakening his body’s ability to defend itself.

Like many patent medicines of the time, Shiloh’s contained “natural,” “herbal” ingredients that had been traditionally used as folk remedies to treat similar conditions. Shiloh’s contained three of these seemingly benign ingredients: peppermint, licorice, and lobelia. Lobelia has an effect similar to tobacco on the nervous system. It also can produce serious side effects if taken in too large a dose, including profuse sweating, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, tremors, rapid heartbeat, mental confusion, convulsions, hypothermia, coma, and even death. The licorice in Shiloh’s was used as an expectorant, offsetting the chloroform, and helping to remove mucus from the lungs.

Among the most dubious of all ingredients in Shiloh’s Consumption Cure was hydrocyanic acid. Used to allay the cough, it was also an exceptionally poisonous chemical that could be fatal at a high dose.

Figure 3.9. Shiloh’s Cure. One of the best-selling consumption remedies, Shiloh’s Cure was clearly the medication of choice of the Michael O’Brien family. Although the ingredients (see recipe) indicate that he would have been well-sedated by the nostrum, there was nothing that would have effected a cure.
The Franks’ Guilty Secret – Allan’s Anti-Fat!

Erica Gibson

Allan’s Anti-Fat. Remedies for a variety of other ailments or conditions, were part of the patent-medicine armory. Among the targets were obesity, which was purportedly cured using Allan’s Anti-Fat.

Annie Frank felt tired; it was Wednesday, cleaning day, and when she had taken the lamps down from the front room wall to clean them, she had dropped one of the chimneys. Tiny glass shards flew everywhere and Annie had spent quite a bit of time—most of it down on her hands and knees—trying to get them all. Struggling to get up from that awkward position just served to remind her that both she and her husband, Charles (who worked as a barkeeper, bottler, and brewery agent), needed to lose some weight [1].

Born and raised in Germany, Charles and Annie had a fondness for their native foods, especially sausages: bauerswurst, blutwurst, pinkelwurst, and Charles’ favorite weisswurst. While they still ate the traditional light evening meal—Abendbrot, or ‘evening bread,’—they indulged heavily in the beers and ales that Charles was able to bring home from work. And of course, a meal wouldn’t be a meal without a little something sweet at the end [2].

Annie felt comfortable about her weight when she and Charles had first bought the house at 818 Magnolia Street in 1877. At that time, Lillian Russell was just becoming popular, and her voluptuous figure mimicked Annie’s. Indeed, Lillian Russell was so celebrated that the deep red American Beauty rose had been named after her. Lately though, more slender women had become the rage. First there had been that Lillie Langtry woman, who caught the Prince of Wales’ eye and became his mistress. When their affair ended, Lillie came to the United States and took up acting. Tall, with a large bosom and hips just like Annie, Lillie was given to morning exercise and long walks of several miles which resulted in a much more slender physique [3]. More recently, Annie had seen pictures of the new national ideal, the Gibson Girl, who was positively skinny!

Resolving that something had to be done, Annie decided to lose weight. And if she was going to lose weight, so was Charles. Morning or evening walks would be a start, but Annie knew she would never get her husband to give up his beloved beer and sausage. She would just have to find another way. Just yesterday, while skimming some periodicals, Annie found an advertisement for Allan’s Anti-Fat. Would this be the answer? The advertisement stated with convincing authority that, “Allan’s Anti-Fat is the great remedy for Corupulency. It is purely vegetable and perfectly harmless. It acts on the food in the stomach preventing its conversion into fat. Taken according to directions, it will reduce a fat person from 2 to 5 pounds a week” [4].

The very next day Annie went for a long walk, straight to the drugstore. There she made her first purchase of Allan’s Anti-Fat. At $1.56 for a 6.5-ounce bottle, it was expensive, but Annie felt the price was worth it—if it worked.

Unbeknownst to Annie, most of Allan’s Anti-Fat was water, along with smaller amounts of potassium iodide, salicylic acid, glycerin, and extract of bladderwrack. This latter ingredient was actually seaweed, a popular obesity cure of the day [5]. While the success of Annie’s efforts at reducing are not known, she obviously kept trying as a total of 13 bottles of Allan’s Anti-Fat patent medicine were recovered from the family’s backyard privy.
Sources for “The Frank’s Guilty Secret”:

1. A privy associated with the Frank family was excavated on Cypress Block 9; these data are presented in Block Technical Report: Historical Archaeology I-880 Cypress Replacement Project: Blocks 4, 5, 6, and 9, edited by Mary Praetzellis and Suzanne B. Stewart, pp. 447-459, 2001, prepared for the California Department of Transportation (hereafter referred to as Block 9 BTR). Their privy was remarkable for the presence of 13 bottles of Allan’s Anti-Fat, along with numerous root beer bottles, as well as beer and other alcoholic-beverage bottles, and a shattered chimney lamp. These are described in the Feature Summary and listed on the Artifact Descriptive List, pp. 451 and 455-456 of the Block 9 BTR. We don’t know whether Annie or Charles Frank purchased the Anti-Fat, we cast Annie in that role because women who kept house full-time were frequently the primary shoppers of the family. This “story” demonstrates the power of advertising (see also Chapter 4, Mullins).

2. The Frank privy did not contain a large enough sample of faunal remains for analysis, and the German foods listed here—processed meats and bread—would not have left archaeological evidence. For the purposes of this “story,” we have assumed that the Franks enjoyed traditional German cooking.


4. The advertisement for Allan’s Anti-Fat comes from the standard bottle reference: Bill and Betty Wilson, 19th Century Medicine in Glass, 1971, p. 16.

5. Dr. Arthur Cramp has written extensively on hoaxes perpetuated on the unwitting consumer by patent-medicine retailers. He discusses Allan’s Anti-Fat on p. 686 of Nostrums and Quackery, 1921.
BECOMING JEWISH AMERICANS
Adrian Praetzellis

We will probably never know whether the artifacts from Privy 1409 at 712 Fifth Street came from the family of Isaac Barnett, Samuel Jacobs, or a combination of the two. Both of these households, however, were made up of German/Polish Jews who made their living peddling fruit.

The Golden Land
To immigrant eastern European Jews, America was die goldeneh medina, “the golden land,” where anything was possible. Although its entry fee—the abandonment of much traditional culture—was high, many people were more than happy to pay the price. To an ambitious immigrant, the greeneheimm, or greenhorn, was the most pitiful of creatures. Conspicuous by his old-country dress and manner, this character was anathema to his co-religionists, an embarrassment that represented everything they had enthusiastically abandoned in Europe. Before ever the first sociologist coined the term “assimilation,” the process of replacing old ways with new was known in Yiddish as ausgrenen—and the practice embraced with zeal. The archaeological remains in the Barnett/Jacobs privy speak of this process and how California Jews participated in it.

Peddling Fruit: A Family Business
Samuel Jacobs immigrated in 1879. The 1880 Population Census finds him living as a boarder in the home of Julia and Jacob Glassman (also a German peddler) in San Francisco. Peddler was a common occupation among new Jewish immigrants. Even the poorest could afford the rent of a cart by the day, either selling their goods door to door or, more likely for fruit sellers like Jacobs, setting up in a street market. It may be that Jacob Glassman was a landsman—someone from the Jacobs’ home district—who established

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Birth Year</th>
<th>Nativity</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Barnett, Isaac</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Fruit peddler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unknown (wife)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jennie (dau)</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Cal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark (son)</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Cal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beatrice (dau)</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Cal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May (dau)</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Cal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harry (son)</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Cal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bear (son)</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Cal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bertie (dau)</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Cal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Barnett, David</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Fruit dealer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(bro)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Jacobs, Samuel</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Fruit peddler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rebecca (wife)</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Data derived from city directories, leases, and US, Population Census.
2 It is likely that Jacobs was from Poznan.
the latter in the peddler’s trade. By 1887 Jacobs had set up on his own and leased the house at 712 Fifth Street, where he and his wife, Rebecca, lived until the mid-1890s. In 1890 Samuel’s brother Isaac—yet another fruit peddler—and his family had bought a home at 762 Fifth Street, on an adjacent block, and lived there for more than 30 years.

The census lists the birthplace of Isaac and Rebecca Jacobs variously as Germany and (after WWI) as Poland, and notes that both spoke Yiddish and Russian. It is likely that the family originated in the German state of Posnan, whose Jewish residents were commonly fluent in Polish, Russian, or German, as well as Yiddish, which was spoken in the home.

Samuel Jacobs had taken over the house at 712 Fifth Street from Isaac Barnett, a Polish-born fruit peddler who had lived there with his wife, six children, and his brother David (who was also in the fruit business), from the early 1880s. Sadly, Bear and Harry, the family’s infant twin sons, died of jaundice on successive days in December 1884. The boys’ names suggest their Jewish origins, for Bear is the English translation of the Hebrew name דוב and even the very English-sounding Harry was a common homonym of the Hebrew name חגי that a later generation would change to חניב (Rottenburg 1977). The family name Barnett is also a common adaptation of דוב (Blatt 1998).

Archaeology of a Jewish Household

Paradoxically, most of the artifacts that now represent the families are household objects that would probably have been chosen and purchased by those who figure the least in the documentary record—the women. Exceptions to this may be the carriage parts, probably from the wagon that was kept in the backyard shed; the seeds of 10 fruit and vegetable species, an unusually wide range, may also reflect the fruit vendor’s trade. Other artifacts, such as the 104 British ale bottles, suggest the idiosyncrasies of one member of the household or another. That six different manufacturers were represented may indicate an accumulation over time.

These items either fit in with what we know of the family from historic records or suggest their personal habits. Other discoveries, however, suggest their cultural trajectory and, through this household, speak of people of similar backgrounds and futures.

### Meat that’s Fit to Eat

Within the system of Jewish dietary laws known as kashrus, ritually acceptable food is said to be kosher; all other is treyfe and not to be eaten. Among the prohibitions of kashrus are those against the consumption of certain mammals, such as pig and rabbit, as well as fishes that lack scales and fins, all shellfish, and animals not ritually slaughtered. In addition, the hindquarters of otherwise acceptable mammals must be purged of the gid ha-nasheh, the sciatic nerve, to make them kosher. This technically difficult procedure, known as trairing, was rarely done; rather, the kosher butcher usually sold the hindquarters of cattle and sheep to non-kosher shops. Thus, hindquarters were effectively treyfe (Donin 1972:116).

#### Meat and Shellfish Remains from Privy 14(9) – Barnett/Jacobs Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHELLFISH</th>
<th>Frags</th>
<th>Hinges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern oyster</td>
<td>7?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Calico scallop</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOOD BONE</th>
<th>Meat Weight (lbs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beef</td>
<td>104.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutton</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pork</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>217.8 lbs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HINDQUARTER ONLY (Beef/Mutton)</th>
<th>Meat Weight (lbs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rump</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindshank</td>
<td>81/1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>467/1.5 lbs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Several fragments; number of hinges cannot be determined.
The table below shows that the remains of two species of shellfish were found among the refuse in Privy 1409. Furthermore, nearly 40 percent of the meat represented (85.4 of 217.8 pounds) was either from a treyfe species or cut from the hindquarters.

It would be difficult to overemphasize the significance of maintaining a kosher home to a family of traditional Jews (Ganzfried 1996). More than merely a tradition, the practice was and is considered a mitzvah, a commandment from God. It was not optional. Today, as in the past, maintaining kashruth has the effect of socially segregating the group, for a traditionally observant Jew could not accept an invitation to eat at the non-kosher home of a friend and business lunches were effectively impossible. While some gentiles understood the situation, others interpreted the practice as arrogance and used it as fuel for the anti-Jewish sentiment of the era. A mechanism for social cohesion within the group, kashruth was also a barrier to advancement and the mark of a grubeneheim.

Thus, the Barnett/Jacobs families would have found themselves confronted with several choices: the culturally conservative course would have been to remain true to the practices of their forebears, buying their food from kosher sources. Alternatively, they might have obtained meat from non-kosher butchers but avoided treyfe species. Or the family could have taken the most extreme course and abandoned kashruth altogether—and this is what archaeological evidence shows they did.

It is revealing to compare the proportion of the three major meat types between the Barnett/Jacobs household and the mean of all other households of the same economic level (skilled working class) in the Cypress Project sample. The similarity is startling, with the Jewish family consuming even more pork than the mean skilled working-class household. From a strictly religious perspective, the consumption of pork was no worse than eating, for example, non-kosher beef hindquarters. Yet it would have had greater symbolic significance because of the particular abhorrence in which the pig is held in Eastern European Jewish folk belief, as well as the medieval practice of force-feeding pork to Jews who refused conversion to Catholicism.

Constriction and Freedom

A corset fastener is a small thing. To find such an object would not be of much note in most archaeological contexts of the period. Here it is different, because this tiny item represents the unnamed woman of this household and the role she took in the process of cultural change.

For centuries, eastern European village communities had been ruled by traditional socio-religious strictures that stipulated a style of women’s clothing and gave limited range for the expression for either fashion or individual taste. For the sake of modesty, married women were expected to conceal their hair under a sheitel, or wig, while the female form was concealed behind shawls, voluminous skirts, and straight-cut dresses. In late-19th-century America, however, the ideal female body type was hourglass-shaped, rounded above and below with a wasp-like waist (Scherier 1995). It was a sculpted look could only be achieved by that science of bodily engineering known as corsetry (see also Chapter 6).

To modern sensibilities, the physical constriction of the corset makes this garment a fitting metaphor for the ‘tight-laced’ Victorian culture of which it was a part. But what did it mean for the woman at 712 Fifth Street, most likely a recent immigrant from an eastern European village, to wear a corset in the 1880s?

It would have been no small matter that clothing no longer marked her ethnicity. Coming from a larger environment in which to be visibly Jewish was to invite ridicule or worse, American clothing offered anonymity. Although the garment was widely used by urban middle-class
Europeans, to women in eastern European Jewish villages, the corset was a uniquely American artifact. While physically constraining, the corset was psychologically and culturally liberating. It represented style and, upon immigration, the elevated status that one could achieve by the apt use of the symbols of fashion; for it showed that the wearer was no gruenehein, but a sophisticated American (Scherier 1995:64).

By 1900 Samuel and Rebecca Jacobs lived in San Francisco with their 14-year-old niece, Gertie, a “tailoress.” Isaac Barnett’s young daughters May (17) and Bertie (13) were “at school,” while 25-year-old Jennie was keeping house. For working-class Jewish girls of the era, Gertie’s path to employment in the needle trades was more common than the place of May and Bertie. Traditional practice would have seen a 25-year-old long married and the elder, or even both, of her sisters at work. While girls’ education was not thought worthwhile by many of the Barnetts’ background, this was yet another way in which the family demonstrated their modern, American values.

Peddlers on the Road to Assimilation

An archaeology based on a single deposit from one household provides a glimpse of a moment seemingly frozen in time. We can project the family’s experience based on what we know of their background and see how the immigrant generation adapted to the circumstances of their new home, but we do not know how the story played out in succeeding generations (cf., Silverstein 1994). In a sense, one’s appetite for information is increased rather than satiated.

Education, clothing, food, language, and personal names—each a seemingly mundane aspect of culture that would nonetheless have had enormous symbolic significance to this immigrant family. Decisions about these small but ultimately defining aspects of life were made at the household level. Though fragmentary and ambiguous, the archaeology of families is a uniquely evocative source of prima facie evidence of the outcome of the many day-to-day negotiations of which 19th-century culture was composed.

If the general process and trajectory of assimilative cultural change seem clear, the mechanisms by which it occurred are not so well understood. There is a great deal to be learned about the everyday practices that either reinforced these changes or worked to counter them.

A family of immigrant Jews, circa 1900. Jacob Peter and Esther Cohen (Adrian Praetzellis’ maternal grandparents) fled the Ukraine and Poland, respectively, in the late 19th century to escape the pogroms of their native countries. While tradition required a beard for men and a wig for married women, Jacob’s sporty mustache and Esther’s natural hair show the couple’s desire to blend into their new country. It is exceedingly unlikely that this tailor’s children would ever have played the middle-class games suggested by the photographer’s props they hold. (Photo courtesy Adrian Praetzellis)
HOPE BUT NO CURE IN OAKLAND

Like Americans all over the country, Oakland residents feared falling victim to consumption and used what was available in the battle against this dreaded disease. While Oakland health officials tried to control outbreaks of tuberculosis, progress was slow. Physicians had little more to offer the consumption patient. Instructions to maintain a “wholesome diet” and “exercise in the fresh air” (Faulkner and Carmichel 1892:129) must have offered little comfort to the patients battling for their lives. The patent medicine industry’s “consumption cures” offered hope in an otherwise dismal prognosis. Its profiteering on the desperation of tuberculosis patients is certainly one of the most massive public frauds ever carried out in the United States.

It may be overly simplistic to state that patent “cures” offered no real benefit to their consumers. Aside from their analgesic qualities, consumption medicines also offered the power of suggestion—and a patient who truly believes that their medicine is an all-powerful serum will often experience temporary improvement. This effect, combined with the many remissions that tuberculosis patients naturally experience, made for a perfect disease from which “cure” manufactures could profit (Cramp 1921).

We can never know what Michael O’Brien experienced. More than likely in his 19 months of sickness, Mr. O’Brien did undergo the fluctuations of tuberculosis, and perhaps attributed these periods of improvement to Shiloh’s Cure. While duped, Mr. O’Brien may have gained a sense of control. If his ultimate fate was not changed through his ingestion of Shiloh’s, the nostrum appears to have offered temporary relief and a glimmer of hope.

HEALTH AND NUTRITION

Adrian Praetzellis

One of the few unequivocal ways in which we can measure material well-being is in the area of health and nutrition. One can ask, what did this population eat and how did their diet compare with that of their contemporaries? Part of the answer lies in the material description of life at the time. Documents show what was available, but what were people of various economic levels and ethnicities actually doing? And how does their behavior compare with that of their contemporaries elsewhere and at earlier periods?

Novelist and social critic Jack London was a passionate writer whose 1903 account of the terrible conditions of the English poor, The People of the Abyss, is credited with having a similar level of influence on attitudes toward poverty in the early 20th century as did the works of Charles Dickens, which transformed British public opinion 50 years earlier. The poverty of his boyhood neighborhood of West Oakland was a constant theme in London’s writings and the genesis of his brand of enthusiastic—if idiosyncratic—socialism. Although contemporary accounts and government reports support much of what London had to say, he told only part of the story of West Oakland, for many working-class people may have found their standard of living to be relatively high.

The rise of trade unionism and class-consciousness were important outcomes of late 19th-century industrialization. Although rapid cycles of economic boom and depression created unstable labor conditions in the West, Oakland’s railroad workers were protected from the worst of these fluctuations by the very size of their employer. Unionism was strong. By 1900 railroad workers were both the most heavily unionized and best paid in the country (U.S. Department of Commerce 1975:166-168).
It was paradoxical, felt London, that the availability of consumer goods and plentiful high-quality food thwarted the movement toward structural change and a socialist economy — revolution — by creating what Lenin called an “aristocracy of labor.” The transient underclass is represented neither in primary historic sources nor in the archaeological record. Regardless of one’s view of London’s political agenda, it is possible to investigate food and nutrition among West Oakland’s working class and see how the archaeological evidence compares to the assertions of contemporary social reformers (see also Chapter 7, Walker).

Reconstructing the late-19th-century diet using documentary sources alone is fraught with problems. Cookbooks and guides are prescriptive, indicating what the authors believed people should eat. The historic interview-based official report is as likely as its modern counterpart to be ridden with misrepresentations, “a sad catalog of self-delusion” (Rathje and Murphy 1992:71) rather than the objective chronicle it purports to be.

Although the diet itself provides valuable information about nutrition, its composition and preparation were influenced by the economic condition and culture of subpopulations, which are themselves important areas of investigation. Simplistic economic modeling might lead one to conclude that households purchase at the highest level of their ability (the poor and the wealthy eat the cheapest and the most expensive foods, respectively). These kinds of taken-for-granted notions are eminently worthy of empirical testing, since between the ability to purchase a commodity and desire to do so sits the multi-layered filter known as culture. As a result, archaeological findings are frequently counter-intuitive: modern garbage studies, for example, have concluded that the wastage of a type of food actually increases as it becomes rarer; and although, pound for pound, candy is one of the most expensive foods, poor people in Mexico City eat more of it than their affluent neighbors (Rathje and Murphy 1992).

Food is more than merely a nutrition delivery system: to various populations in 19th-century Oakland, it had ethnic, class, ideological, and even political significance. The massive influx of immigrants in the mid-and-late 19th century engendered a curious mixture of nativism, fear, and — in the Domestic Reform movement — the desire to improve the standard of living of these newcomers by the rationalization of housework (Figure 3.10). Although the latter is credited with having a profound effect on the trajectory of America culture and social life, its sway over the material culture of the home seems to have been minor (see Chapter 6, Gutman). Thus, we can speculate that the movement’s homogenizing influence may have been similarly ineffective on the patchwork of cultures that made up West Oakland. This chapter emphasizes that archaeology can contribute prima facie evidence to the discussion by examining and comparing the consumer choices of West Oaklanders — especially immigrant and non-white households — in the realm of food.

The Meaning of Meat

Historians have long recognized general correspondence between a household’s expenditure on meat and its relative wealth/social class. “People ate,” wrote nutritionist H.J. Teuteberg, “according to the estate into which they were born” (1975:71). As analysts of material remains, historical archaeologists have taken up the study. However, while the correlation between wealth and the quality of meat purchased is often relatively clear in institutional settings (e.g., Schulz and Gust 1983), it is less so in domestic ones (e.g., Henry 1987). The remains of expensive meat cuts cannot be taken as an unambiguous marker of either wealth or elevated social position.
Mary Maniery's (2002) study of a California labor camp, for example, concluded that 40 percent of the meat eaten by the workers could be classed as expensive. These results surely reflect the 6,000-calories-per-day diet needed to maintain the laborers’ demanding work, but functionalist explanations may not always be in order.

The counter-intuitive character of archaeological findings relating to diet is frequently one of their most important contributions. Considering the problem of representativeness (or the lack thereof) of the archaeological record, what can be said about the diet of West Oaklanders?

A great deal is known about food in 19th-century America. Reliable government statistics have been collected for more than 150 years (e.g., U.S. Department of Commerce 1975) and detailed studies of the diets of a variety of households are available; the supply of books and articles on the subject shows no sign of abating. Such a superfluity of scholarly scribbling might be thought to preclude the possibility of important new insights. Yet, archaeology on a household scale makes a contribution that complements, qualifies, and deepens the revelations of those scholars whose data derive from the printed page. The existing historic record has problems that cannot be solved by analysis: problems of scale, representativeness, and accuracy.

Official statistics document the import, production, and sale of almost every conceivable commodity; yet the scale is such that one cannot apply the data to particular populations in specific places and times. Household diet studies list the foods consumed daily by representative households of various social classes and ethnicities in the 1890s. Presented as models of objective science, they are ideals; for, as Bill Rathje’s Garbage Project has repeatedly shown, people are less than candid when reporting what they consume (Rathje and Murphy 1992).
With anecdotal accounts on one end of the spectrum and statistical conglomerations on the other, archaeology is in an ideal position to fill the gap with empirical data available from no other source. Archaeology can also bring to bear an anthropological perspective that views food as material culture. Through it, we can both document what discrete populations actually did and put this information into its cultural and historical context—seeing how the class of artifact called ‘food’ operated in the society of the era—to address the central question:

*What did meat mean?*

**The Archaeological Food-Bone Data**

Our archaeological research design posed questions about consumer behavior among the various ethnic and economic groups who lived in West Oakland. The study of these questions was seen as an opportunity to

- examine the eating habits of these populations,
- investigate the degree to which the latter were affected by economic and cultural factors, and
- test the notion that class/wealth and ethnicity determined what people purchased.

While historical archaeologists have examined the archaeological manifestations of class and ethnicity for some time, most analysis has been done on a small scale, comparing one household to another. The Cypress Project, however, allows a whole new level of analysis due to

- the large number of collections discovered,
- the methodological uniformity of excavation and analysis of these collections, and
- the reliability of the historical associations for each collection, which has enabled researchers to link materials with documented households.

Taken together, these qualities create what may be an unprecedented degree of control over this type and quantity of archaeological data, making it useful to apply statistical analyses not attempted heretofore (Figure 3.11). Furthermore, the relatively large number of collections involved allows us to examine two of the models that archaeologists commonly use to interpret their data: first, the assumption that consumer purchasing patterns follow a model of economic rationality whereby wealthier households purchase more expensive commodities than poorer ones; and second, that

Figure 3.11. A grand collection. Nearly 2,000 pounds of meat are represented by the bones in Well 7511, associated with the 1890s households of Southern Pacific workers, mostly African American Pullman Car porters. While this one is clearly exceptional, many of the Cypress Project faunal assemblages are robust, allowing a variety of statistical studies.
Table 3.1. Archaeological Features with Faunal Remains and the Households that Created them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Date (ca.)</th>
<th>Occupational Class</th>
<th>House Type</th>
<th>O/E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Privy 900</td>
<td>Mann household</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>P+</td>
<td>APH</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pit 928+</td>
<td>Centini family</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>Ita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Privy 933+</td>
<td>Tilghman household</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Privy 951</td>
<td>Paddock/Swain household</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Privy 947</td>
<td>Donavan family</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Well 953</td>
<td>Carter household</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Well 968</td>
<td>Brady family</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>APH</td>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Privy 993</td>
<td>Judell store/household</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Privy 955</td>
<td>Irving family</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>Scot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Privy 954</td>
<td>French family</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>APH</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Privy 985</td>
<td>Bredhoff household</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>P+</td>
<td>PVH</td>
<td>Ger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Privy 1431</td>
<td>Van Epps family</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Privy 1409</td>
<td>Barnett/Jacobs household</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>Ger/j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pit 1354</td>
<td>Weber family</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>APH</td>
<td>Ger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Well 1300</td>
<td>Breen family</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>APH</td>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pit 1317</td>
<td>Kinsella household</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pit 1469</td>
<td>Tierney household</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>AA/Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Privy 1452+</td>
<td>Stewart household</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>PVH</td>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Privy 1454</td>
<td>Fallon household</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Privy 1785</td>
<td>Curtis family</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>P+</td>
<td>PVH</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Privy 1858</td>
<td>Tighe family</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>APH</td>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pit 1753</td>
<td>Taylor family</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pit 1747</td>
<td>Hickey/Loomis family</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Well 1703+</td>
<td>Bankhead family</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pit 3137</td>
<td>Dutton family</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Privy 3139</td>
<td>Bush family</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>APH</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Privy 3178</td>
<td>McDonald household</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>APH</td>
<td>Can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Privy 3185</td>
<td>Murray household</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>IWV</td>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pit 3196</td>
<td>Scott household</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>PVH</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Privy 3300+</td>
<td>Chapman household</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>PVH</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Privy 3346</td>
<td>Morgan household</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>PVH</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pit 3382</td>
<td>Lufkin household</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Privy 1454</td>
<td>Farmer household</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>APH</td>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Privy 3830</td>
<td>Quinn family</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Privy 3828</td>
<td>Tate household</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>PVH</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Privy 3802</td>
<td>McDonald household</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>APH</td>
<td>Scot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Privy 4220</td>
<td>Broderick family</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Privy 4245</td>
<td>Corrigan family</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Privy 4236+</td>
<td>Vogt family</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>U.S./Ger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
Table 3.1. Faunal Remains (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Date (ca.)</th>
<th>Occupational Class</th>
<th>House Type</th>
<th>O/E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Privy 4234</td>
<td>Barry family and tenants</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Privy 10102</td>
<td>Frank family</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>PVH</td>
<td>Ger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Privy 8445</td>
<td>Holderer family</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Privy 6260</td>
<td>Leonhard household</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>Ger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Privy 6239</td>
<td>Hansen-Hayles families</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>Ger/Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Privy 6292</td>
<td>Finley family</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Privy 6325</td>
<td>Robertson family</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>APH</td>
<td>Can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Privy 6282</td>
<td>Haynes family</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Well 7500</td>
<td>Weisheimer family</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>U.S./Ger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Well 7511</td>
<td>Southern Pacific household</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>APH</td>
<td>AA/Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Well 300</td>
<td>O’Brien family</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>PVH</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Pit 574</td>
<td>O’Brien family</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>PVH</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pit 2855</td>
<td>Fischer family</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>Ger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pit 2809+</td>
<td>McLaughlin household</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>U/P</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Privy 2822</td>
<td>McLaughlin household</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>U/P</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pit 2870</td>
<td>O’Brien household</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Privy 2786+</td>
<td>Lewis household</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Privy 2719</td>
<td>Hudson household</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Well 2007</td>
<td>Lawrence and Ward families</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>PVH</td>
<td>U.S./Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Pit 2404</td>
<td>Crocker family</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Privy 4714</td>
<td>Gohsen family</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>PVH</td>
<td>Ger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Privy 4724+</td>
<td>McNamara family</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Privy 4648</td>
<td>McNamara rental</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Pit 2524</td>
<td>Unknown renter</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Pit 2504</td>
<td>Crocker household</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Privy 100</td>
<td>Huddleson household</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>APH</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Privy 101</td>
<td>Stryker household</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>APH</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Privy 141</td>
<td>O’Connell family</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Privy 156</td>
<td>Long family</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Ger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
Plus sign following feature number indicates additional contexts included (see Appendix C: Feature Associations by Block).

Date ca. = Estimated deposition date

Occupational Class: P = Professional; P+ = Wealthy Professional; S = Skilled Worker; U = Unskilled Worker.

Two types of residents, L = Landlady and W = Widow, could not generally be assigned to an occupational class.

House Type: APH = Almost Polite House; IWC = Informal Workers’ Cottage; PVH = Polite Victorian House (see Appendix D for definitions).

O/E = Origin or Ethnicity: U.S. = U.S. white; AA = U.S. black; Ger = German; Scot = Scottish; J = Jewish; Can = Canadian; Eng = English; Ita = Italian.

(see Chapter 1 for further definitions)
foodways, long known as the most culturally conservative trait, reflect ethnicity/nativity and can be an indicator of cultural change.

In this essay, I examine the food-bone data for 68 archaeological features, combining and recom-bining the data according to the occupation/class, origin/ethnicity, neighborhood, the gender of the head of household, and the house type of the households that created them (Table 3.1). The goal of this analysis is to determine whether statistically significant patterns exist in the grouped data and, if so, which of these represent real behavioral differences between the groups and which are meaningless statistical artifacts, the result of differences in sample size or similar factors. Bruce Owen, whose comments form the basis of “By the Numbers,” performed the statistical analysis. The raw data, his methods, and report are reproduced as Appendix F.

By the Numbers: Neighborhoods and Meat

Our West Oakland study area was divided into three neighborhoods—West of Market, East of Market, and Oakland Point (see Figure 2.1)—divisions that would have been familiar to 19th-century Oaklanders. Market Street was seen as an important division: residents on the east side were perceived as oriented toward the cosmopolitan downtown core, whereas those on the west—including the well-known West of Market Boys—saw themselves as the “real” Oaklanders. To the west of Willow Street was Oakland Point: adjacent to the Southern Pacific Railroad yards, this was an area of small homes, residential hotels, and light industry.

Throughout the statistical studies, the Wilcoxon rank-sum test (also called the Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon test) was applied to compare the samples quantitatively in cases with two classes and the Kruskal-Wallis test, the equivalent for more than two classes. There is clear patterning by neighborhood in meat preference by species but none in the cost of meat purchased. The most evident pattern is in mutton, which has a significantly non-random distribution among the three neighborhoods (Figure 3.12). West of Market has significantly higher percentages of mutton than either the East of Market or Oakland Point. West of Market had a correspondingly lower percentage of beef than the others, although the pattern is significant only in comparison with the East of Market neighborhood at the 5 percent level. It seems that people in the West of Market neighborhood were substituting mutton for beef, relative to the others.

While it is tempting to conclude that the greater prevalence of mutton in the West of Market neighborhood is because this was an Irish district, the reality is not so clear. The West of Market sample does have a higher percentage of Irish units (35%) than the East of Market (26%) or Oakland Point (17%) neighborhoods, and while these differences are of the correct nature to explain the neighborhood species patterning, they are not large enough to do so.

Figure 3.12. Kitchen butchering. A large number of the bone pieces in Cypress assemblages fit together, identifying them as the products of home butchering. In this sample from Well 7511, there are visible ax/cleaver marks, probably the result of reducing the cuts for preparation of soups and stews. Kitchen butchering was most common with mutton.
Interestingly, there is no parallel pattern in the distribution of meat-cut costs. Although the percentages suggest that the Oakland Point neighborhood had generally less expensive cuts, the pattern is not statistically significant. In any case, it is not Oakland Point, but the West of Market neighborhood that stands out as different in species preference. It appears to be intermediate, not extreme, in cut costs. This all suggests that the neighborhood differences relate more to preferences than to economics.

**By the Numbers: Gender**

Is it possible to determine the influence of gender on meat purchases? Unfortunately, our results are difficult to interpret.

The population census and city-directory data indicate that some households were headed by women but did not always show which of the others were definitely headed by men, as opposed to being unknown or assumed. For this reason, we have used the clumsy woman/non-woman categories to distinguish between these households.

Five of the six woman-headed households were Irish (a pattern that is interesting in itself), and three of the six lived in Informal workers’ cottages. Since the small number of woman-headed households was so concentrated in certain subsets of the sample, we compared them to all the other residences, to the other Irish households, and to samples from the other Informal workers’ cottages. In this way, we hoped to be able to separate the effect of the head of household’s gender from that of their ethnicity or dwelling type.

Few statistically significant differences emerged. Woman-headed households appear to have had significantly more mutton and less pork than non-woman headed households, a pattern that holds at the 5 percent level of confidence. This might be due to the woman-headed households being Irish, and the Irish generally having more mutton (see the discussion below). Conversely, the apparent Irish preference for mutton might equally well result from the high number of woman-headed households in the Irish sample.

**By the Numbers: Economics, Ethnicity, and Meat**

Each of the samples was assigned to one of four economic/profession (e/p) categories based on the occupation of the head of the household: Unskilled, Skilled, Professional, Professional+. Each sample was also assigned according to the predominant ethnicity and/or nativity (e/n) of the household: US-born white American, African American, Irish, English, Scots, Italian, Jewish, and German.

The most surprising result is that samples representing the four household e/p categories do not relate as clearly or consistently as might be expected in relation to either meat species (beef, mutton, or pork) or meat-cut cost (high, medium, or low). If we consolidate the professions into “low status” (Skilled and Unskilled) and “high status” (Professional and Professional+), no significant differences in either meat species or cut cost, even at the 10 percent level, can be seen. Since Unskilled seems to be the lone genuinely distinctive category, and its distinctiveness is reduced by combining it with the Skilled sample in this scheme, this is not a surprising outcome. Wealthy (P+) households consumed more expensive meat than the two categories below them, but there is no linear relationship between wealth and cost of meat. Not only did Unskilled households not have the most economical cuts but, on the contrary, the percentage data suggest that they were more similar to the P+ category in their consumption of high-cost cuts.

There may be a weak pattern in the preference for pork: the percentage data suggest that it becomes more common as one progresses from lower to higher economic categories; this is
reflected in a difference at the 5 percent level between the U and P households, the latter showing more pork. With this exception, we can say with confidence that there are no clear differences in meat species utilized between the e/p categories.

The same data were examined by the ethnicity/nativity (e/n) of the households to distinguish differences in the meat consumption of these populations. Comparing U.S.-born whites to the other e/n categories revealed some differences: the former show less beef than African Americans and Germans at the 5 and 10 percent levels, respectively. When compared with a combination of all others, Irish households show a preference for mutton at the 10 percent level. Surprisingly, none of the e/n categories differ from each other at either the 5 or 10 percent confidence level in meat-cut cost (high, medium, or low). Thus, we can say with confidence that no single ethnicity/nativity group ate consistently more expensively or cheaply than any of the others.

While these differences between e/n categories are statistically significant, it would take the analysis of additional collections to determine if the pattern is behaviorally meaningful or an aberration. By the same token, to state that there is no statistically significant difference between most of the categories that were examined is not the same as saying that the categories do not differ. It simply means that any difference that may exist is not great enough to be detected with confidence with the given sample size. Actual differences may be too subtle and obscured by individual variation to be picked up with confidence. Although as archaeological data go, these are highly controlled, overall patterns are more likely to reflect real differences and similarities than carefully chosen comparisons.

After the statistical tests that produced these results had been run, we scanned the raw percentages of high-, medium-, and low-cost meat remains between the e/p categories and noticed an interesting pattern: the meat purchases of the wealthiest households (P+) seemed to more closely resemble those of the poorest families (U). Similarly, the middling groups, S and P, resembled each other. To test this observation, data representing the two sets of e/p categories — U/P+ (n = 8) and S/P (n = 35), respectively — were combined and compared.

The combined U/P+ category was found to be quite different from the S/P, being composed of more medium-cost cuts — and, consequently, fewer high and low ones. The difference was significant at the 5 percent level with a probability of 0.0062, the smallest of any compared sets. By the same token, U/P+ households had more high-cost cuts than S/P, a probability of 0.0656. The fact that these patterns appear mostly in the medium-cost cuts, but not consistently in the high-cost cuts or at all in the low cost ones, suggest that the influence of a household’s e/p characteristics on meat purchases was complex, and not simply a reflection of their ability to pay.

Representativeness is as important in archaeological analysis as it is difficult to control. If some of these collections are the products of wildly idiosyncratic behavior, the apparent patterns may not be noteworthy. With that caveat in mind, our data strongly indicate that the working-class people of West Oakland ate far greater quantities of expensive meat than one might expect from the occasional Sunday dinner or holiday celebration.

What could be the explanation?
**Science at the Table**

Prized but not always available, meat was the most sought-after food in the homes of working-class Americans in the middle of the 19th century. Vegetables, on the other hand, were valued only for taste, variety, and for the bulk they provided. Many people were positively mistrustful of green vegetables, blaming them (in some cases with justification) for the spread of cholera and other diseases endemic to the newly industrial cities, whose populations had outgrown their infrastructures (Cummings 1941:43). Well into the 20th century, potatoes and products made of cereal flour filled, with varying adequacy, most peoples’ nutritional needs. The 20th century saw a massive decline in the consumption of carbohydrates in the form of starch from sources such as bread and cereal, while the daily per-capita consumption of beef nearly doubled between 1910 and 1976 (Brewster and Jacobson 1978).

The first scientific study of the American diet was undertaken in 1874. It was not until the late 1880s, however, that the combined resources of businessman Edward Atkinson and nutritionist Wilbur Atwater led to a pivotal series of articles in the reformist *Century* and *Domestic Science* magazines. Atkinson and Atwater were a pair of Victorian rationalists who believed that the country’s social problems could be defined and solved by science. Behavioral change would proceed quite naturally from education, or so they believed. The poor, wrote Atwater, must be “free from ignorance and prejudice, and must understand the principles that underlie the right practice of the arts of life” (1888:444).

Their zeal was driven by anecdotal accounts and, later, by survey data that demonstrated that working-class people sometimes paid more for food than was necessary to get adequate nutrition. This situation was abhorrent to the reformist pair for its inefficient use of resources. Atwater felt that if the poor spent their money wisely on more nutritious food, they would have more for housing and clothes. As a chemist, Atwater did not concern himself with such irrelevancies as palatability and desire; only nutrition was significant in “scientific eating” (Cummings 1941:80).

The social effects of industrialization were clear, and empirical studies of the working-class diet in the United Kingdom and North America were initiated in both regions in the 1880s (Oddy 1976). Men like Atwater and Rowntree (1902)—who brought public attention to the terrible conditions of English industrial workers—were social reformers as well as scientists. One reformer after another complained that working-class households, even the poorest, spent too much of their money on high-quality meat and continued to do so even when told of the error of their ways (Rowntree 1902). Those who did economize on meat cuts made up for the savings by purchasing lavish sauces and

---

**Expert Opinion?**

The experts get it wrong sometimes.

Writing before an understanding of the crucial role of vitamins and minerals in healthy eating, Wilbur Atwater and the followers of scientific, rational housekeeping suggested that the “cost of a diet may be diminished by consuming less fruit, less expensive cuts of meat, and fewer vegetables” (Atwater and Bryant 1898:72).

One might also muse on the words of nutritionists Brewster and Jacobson, who predicted that “because imitation meat made from soybeans is a low-cost and low-fat alternative to red meat, we may see more and more of it in the future” (1978:65). From the vantage point of nearly 30 years it is clear that, like their 19th-century predecessor, Dr. Atwater, these scientists placed too much confidence in a rational, modern-day form of optimal foraging over cultural decision-making.
relishes to counteract the dull fare (Figure 3.13). The poorest Italian immigrants to Chicago would not dream of buying anything but Italian olive oil, in spite of its high cost relative to similar products (Atwater and Bryant 1898:15). Commodities like wheat flour, rice, potatoes, and beans could provide the same quality of nutrition at a fraction of the cost of beef. But only meat would suffice, and the working class “showed little interest in increasing their intake of vegetation proteins” (Oddy 1976:225).

Anecdotes describing the profligate working class (such as the following story from Wilbur Atwater’s classic tract “The Pecuniary Economy of Food”) appear frequently in the writings of the era’s reform-minded nutritionists: In the 1880s, a Boston butcher asked a poor seamstress why she purchased tenderloin and not the cheaper round or sirloin steak. She replied indignantly, “Do you suppose because I don’t come here in my carriage I don’t want just as good meat as rich folks have?” (Atwater 1888, emphasis added).

Atwater felt that the core of this problem was in “the conceit, let us call it, that there is some kind of mysterious virtue in these kinds of foods that . . . have the highest price” (1888:437). Although the butcher’s tale may be literally true, it has the feel of allegory, a form to which the Victorians were quite partial in their tireless search for moral lessons. To Atwater, the widow’s behavior was an extravagance that represented the irrational, unscientific approach to household economics endemic among the working class.

Writing of 19th-century Germany, Teuteberg summed up both the situation and the frustration of the scientists who encountered it: “Economic necessities certainly did shape nutritional behavior . . . in the direction of greater rationality, but irrational motives continued to play a part . . . expenditures for food were, in many cases uneconomical and conditioned by emotion” (1975:102). Far from purchasing food appropriate to their economic station, the poor industrial workers of 19th-century Massachusetts “want the best food and are the most fastidious” (Massachusetts Labor Bureau, quoted in Atwater 1888:442). Why couldn’t the working class just be sensible?

Republicanism and Meat

In the 1832 account of her visit to America, the imperious Frances Trollope comments on the widespread belief in social equality among white Americans (Trollope 1960). The republican ideology manifested itself in a lack of deference to one’s social betters, a traditional convention in Europe. Although hardly shocking to modern sensibilities, to an English lady of the 1820s
this was an appalling breach that brought to mind the excesses of the French revolution and the
democratic goals of the Chartists at home.

Mrs. Trollope was not alone in her concern. While Jeffersonian democracy was lauded in
North America, the middle class nevertheless feared the ambitions of the “rabble.” Victorianism
(Howe 1976) and its social restraints were, in part, a reaction to the social turmoil of the era, as the
middle class sought to establish a safe and structured environment. This was particularly notable
in the home, where a raft of etiquette books published from the 1840s onward show the ever-
increasing ritualization of dining (Schlesinger 1946). In the public realm, education based on
the principals of domestic reform would elevate the working class and immigrants, allowing
them to see the error of their old habits.

Paul Shackel (1998) has demonstrated how overtly political republicanism could be
displayed through consumer goods such as tableware. We suggest that the working-class
households of West Oakland expressed, in their selections of food, the values described by Mrs.
Trollope. Atwater sums up the attitude of the 19th-century American: “to economize closely is
beneath us. We do not want to live cheaply, we want to live well,” economizing was incompatible
with “our dignity as free-born Americans” (1888:445). In the same way that displaying the
appropriate parlor paraphernalia showed one’s attachment to certain values, eating meat above
one’s station was also an expression of egalitarian, republican sentiment. Thus, the meaning of
meat (or at least expensive meat) is less clearly not an outcome of pure economics. Its purchase
by working-class Oaklanders was not the economically rational act envisioned by Atwater,
wherein choice should be determined by one’s ability to pay and where meat is conceived of as
little more than nutrient mass in its predigested stage.

In the field of microeconomics it is axiomatic that, all else being equal, resources are allocated
so as to maximize the benefit gained from them. Similarly, modern theories of rational choice
emphasize how people anticipate alternative outcomes and various courses of action and decide
which will be best for them; “rational individuals choose the alternative that is likely to give
them the greatest satisfaction” (Carling 1992:27). Household nutrition studies tend to begin
with an assumption of the primacy of nutrition and economics in the household decision-making
process. On the supply side are variables such as availability and price, while consumer-side
constraints involve the ability of the purchaser to pay and their preferences. Historians and
archaeologists have been studying the role of ethnicity in food choices for years, while social
class has received less attention except as a function of the customer’s ability and willingness to
pay.

Two things we know for sure:

- there was no neat correspondence between a family’s wealth and the purchase of
  high-quality cuts of meat in 19th-century Oakland;
- and, as Dr. Atwater would have agreed, the meaning of meat extended beyond
  nourishment.

What the 19th-century reformers saw as an oddity is suggested by our studies of West
Oakland households to be a distinctive working-class practice. Rather than a behavioral quirk
or statistical outlier, the purchase of commodities above one’s conventionally assigned status
seems to have been a common practice. We continue this topic in Chapter 11. There we use
additional classes of artifacts to suggest that this was not irrational behavior. For in the remains
of their meals and other purchases, we see people seeking to advance goals that had less to do
with nutrition or class emulation than with pride and identity.
CHAPTER 4

CONSUMING ASPIRATIONS:
BRIC-A-BRAC AND THE POLITICS OF
VICTORIAN MATERIALISM
IN WEST OAKLAND

PAUL R. MULLINS

INTRODUCTION

In 1881 Oakland’s Health Officer E.H. Woolsey complained to the city council that “many populated streets are not provided with sewers,” emphasizing that the “ventilation of our street sewers is an urgent requirement, for at present the principal escape of the fetid and noxious gases is through the ordinary house-traps, into sleeping rooms” (1881:71). These conditions were not significantly better in July 1894, when the subsequent city Health Officer reported that “the sewers had not been flushed since January, resulting in their bad condition at present” (Oakland Enquirer 1894b).

The sewer system’s January 1894 flushing did not come soon enough for the residents at 737-1/2 Myrtle Street. On 13 January Oakland’s Health Officer was compelled to evict the residents because the home was considered “unfit for human habitation by reason of defective plumbing and drainage” (Oakland Enquirer 1894a). When the residents at 737-1/2 Myrtle Street were expelled, their West Oakland neighbors included Harry Pierson Chapman, an Illinois-born paperhanger who lived at 828 Myrtle Street between 1892 and 1896 (Privy 3300/Pit 3301). Like any resident of the area, Chapman certainly would have been hard-pressed to overlook the unsanitary state of the community. Indeed, the Chapman’s own backyard contained an open depression that attracted rats that gnawed much of the pit’s exposed food remains; remains of at least five rats, a cat, and a kitten were recovered from the pit’s archaeological assemblage. Yet, in contrast to the community’s sanitary disorder and the household’s less-than-antiseptic yard, the Chapman home was populated by a rich array of decorative material culture ranging from Asian ceramics, to glass vases, to a pair of porcelain figurines. Two of these objects at least symbolically recast those objective conditions through the most mundane Victorian decorative goods. The 2-1/2-inch tall porcelain figurines depict two characters seated on chamber pots, a curious motif with relatively bewildering meaning (Figure 4.1). They are only two inexpensive and symbolically enigmatic items in an assemblage of nearly 1,500 objects, so it is tempting to simply ignore them as quaint but inconsequential whimsies. Yet with a modest rethinking of material symbolism, we can begin to see these objects as penetrating, albeit oblique, observations on turn-of-the-century society.

Like most late-19th century bric-a-brac, these curious chamber-pot figures were not mirrors of the real world as much as they were distorted symbols of what their possessors wished it to be. In the midst of West Oakland’s poor drainage, sewer, and plumbing conditions, the Chapman figurines served as a concrete symbol that distanced the household from the consequences of
Figure 4.1. The Chapmans’ porcelain chamber-pot figurines. These two porcelain figurines are typical of the oblique social commentaries and ambiguous symbolic mechanics of bric-a-brac. The chamber-pot figures romanticized their consumers’ distance from a distinctly non-genteel practice; they indirectly illuminated the dilemmas of public sanitation, and they provided whimsical and ambiguous symbolism. These figures were recovered from 828 Myrtle Street (Privy 3300/ Pit 3301), the ca. 1890s home of paperhanger Harry Pierson Chapman.

poor sanitary conditions. Dressed in a gilded skirt and bonnet and wearing a trace of red lip coloring, the female figure provides a curiously dignified demeanor to one of the most basic of human experiences. Alongside her now-decapitated partner, the pair made it possible to comment on an activity few people share with each other, let alone display in their front room. Yet the childlike figures project an innocent humor onto the realities of a universal albeit unexpressed experience—and the broader dilemmas of public sanitation—in one of many communities aspiring to improve public sewer conditions. In the 1890s, proper Victorians and aspiring gentility were abandoning chamber pots for a range of new sanitary technologies, so the figures illuminated significant Victorian transformations by overemphasizing their consumers’ distance from “uncouth” historical practices. These figurines had no impact on objective sanitary conditions in West Oakland, but they did furtively reflect and shape how the household perceived and expressed those conditions.

Archaeological Approaches to Bric-a-Brac

Examining just these two trinkets emphasizes how bric-a-brac complicates standard archaeological analyses that fixate on function, cost, quantity, and self-evident symbolism. Most archaeological analysis is based on artifact function, which traditionally is defined as the utilitarian union of physical form and task (e.g., a projectile point is manufactured for hunting, a hammer is made for driving nails). The Chapman figurines’ function can be termed ornamentation or decorative furnishing, but the notions of ornamentation and decoration are quite ambiguous and do not provide a concrete sense of the meaning these figurines assumed in the Chapman household. The suggestion that these things should be ignored because they are found so infrequently is imprudent, because the paucity of archaeological bric-a-brac likely reflects distinctive curation processes. For instance, one Greek-American born in West Oakland in 1915 noted that she and her siblings rarely entered their front room: “That was like a museum. My mother’s house is a museum” (Karnegis 1996:11). Victorian parlors were generally stocked with a household’s showpiece furnishings and reserved for “public” entertaining and social ceremony, so the specialized care for decorative parlor objects should be reflected in low breakage rates (compare similar patterns in Mullins 1999:163).

While historical archaeologists devote considerable attention to artifact value, an analysis focused on cost and the assumed social cachet of pricey objects does not provide much insight into bric-a-brac symbolism. In most cases, bric-a-brac was quite inexpensive, yet it had sufficient social consequence to populate the homes of elite and working classes alike.
Decorative-arts scholars interpret household material culture such as bric-a-brac by assessing its aesthetic style; such an analysis would identify distinct motifs and relate them to broader stylistic patterns, design movements (e.g., Beaux-Arts, Colonial Revival), and dominant decorative counsel. This provides some useful insight, but it underestimates how clearly defined aesthetic design movements were themselves reinterpreted by bric-a-brac producers and consumers; that is, any given home might have objects that borrowed from many different decorative movements, and single mass-produced objects often incorporated elements from multiple styles. Focusing on style and dominant counsel also suggests that stylistic mavens, producers, and moral ideologues—rather than consumers—determined the meaning of objects.

The challenge in interpreting Victorian bric-a-brac lies in defining the range of possible meanings in objects and then building a persuasive case to argue why certain consumers favored particular meanings from that range of possibilities. What specific examples of bric-a-brac meant is difficult to fathom without knowing about the consumers themselves. This is not utterly unlike symbolism in any material object: the meaning of any object is a complex, situationally distinct amalgam of producer-imposed symbolism as well as specific consumers’ sentiments. Those sentiments are shaped by personal and group identity, including class, ethnicity, gender, and any other dimension of identity. Consequently, bric-a-brac interpretation demands an appreciation of the consumer who invested an object with meaning, not simply an understanding of function, aesthetic motifs, artifact quantity, or cost.

Bric-a-brac is a somewhat ambiguous term that refers to a range of primarily decorative objects common in American homes from about 1850 into the 1930s. Ornamental objects such as figurines, vases, statuary, and chromolithographs were produced in staggering quantities in the late 19th century; their use was discussed extensively in household literature, and they could be purchased in virtually any American market for relatively modest expense. The definition of decoration and its distinction from function are admittedly unclear, since most material objects have functional utility and decorative symbolism that are difficult to separate. Most Victorian parlor furniture, for instance, had genuine utility, but genteel consumers also valued furnishings for their inferred capacity to fabricate and exhibit a genteel social identity. Some goods like flowerpots and bird feeders certainly had strictly defined utilitarian purposes (i.e., to hold plants and bird feed), but potted plants and songbirds were themselves ornamental, much like ceramic figurines. Rather than cast a narrow definition of bric-a-brac, this chapter approaches bric-a-brac as a broad range of household goods produced expressly or primarily for ornamentation and accepts that most Victorians did not make a particularly clear distinction between function and ornamentation.

The stunning quantity of household material culture recovered during the Cypress Archaeology Project excavations provides a rare opportunity to study decorative objects discarded by a diverse range of late-Victorian urban consumers. The material culture of West Oakland’s Irish, African Americans, Chinese, U.S.-born whites, and a broad swath of European immigrants provides a unique opportunity to examine how various middle- and working-class groups negotiated, reproduced, and/or ignored Victorian ideologies. In a nation increasingly defined by material consumption, the apparently mundane purchase of household material goods was a small yet meaningful way Americans positioned themselves both against and within class, racial, nationalist, regional, and materialist ideologies. Despite its apparent triviality a century later, Victorians regarded decorative material culture as a disciplinary mechanism that taught morality, fostered high culture, and confirmed American affluence. Yet these objects were themselves so symbolically enigmatic, and the discourses surrounding bric-a-brac so hotly
contested from the 1850s to 1930s, that the same object could accommodate a relatively wide range of meanings. Consequently, a single piece of bric-a-brac potentially could be an assimilative mechanism, an empowering symbol of resistance, a potent criticism of social inequality, or—more likely—all these things at the same time (Mullins 1999).

**Chapter Overview**

A sensitive understanding of how various consumers perceived their identities and positions within American society compels us to look systematically and creatively at household minutia such as that in West Oakland. This chapter begins by introducing the idea that seemingly innocuous objects can be seen as “ politicized.” Objects’ symbolism is more complex than function or cost disclose, and their meaning is not imposed by elite or other dominant groups; instead, bric-a-brac’s meaning was contested, and this conflict harbors distinctive insight into consumer identities, social tensions, and systemic influences.

The second section examines the “morals” of household material culture. Commodities ranging from furniture to bric-a-brac were routinely consumed with the express intent of forging some morality that could focus on religion, high culture, class identity, patriarchy, nationalism, and any other number of facets of consumer identity.

The third section examines household decorative meaning and the ambiguous symbolism of bric-a-brac. Decorative-arts scholars and some archaeologists have championed a powerful attachment to material analysis that focuses on how objects fit within stylistic genres, but mass-produced minutia is difficult to pigeonhole within aesthetic categories. Schools of decorative art (e.g., Colonial Revival, Arts and Craft Movement) viewed object symbolism within well-defined philosophies, but mass production borrowed liberally from stylistic trends and looked to public space for its complex and oft-indistinct symbolism: Nationalism, classical history, imperialism, nature, faith, race, and gender were among the many highly charged social issues that found material form in decorative goods. The decorative fare produced by factories often did not have any concrete philosophical foundation: manufacturers simply reproduced popular symbols and left consumers with the most significant work of “making sense” of those symbols.

The fourth section probes the relationship between desire and bric-a-brac and assesses the rights and possibilities many Americans envisioned in commodities. The widespread conviction in American affluence is clearly reflected in the archetypal Victorian interior stocked with an eclectic clutter of exotic goods. This section examines how such decorative codes were reproduced and modified in a series of West Oakland households. The following section examines how consumers were provided models for household materialism in public spaces like department stores and Pullman railroad cars. Several West Oakland households were homes to Pullman porters, so the section probes how these families reproduced—as well as resisted—such ideological models. The chapter concludes by assessing how the West Oakland households negotiated the prominent thread of religiosity and domestic ideology projected onto household goods.
BRIC-A-BRAC’S SYMBOLIC “POLITICS”

The contestation of Victorian material meanings illuminates objects’ subtle but significant politicized symbolism. “Politics” is traditionally viewed as a set of articulate societal or group goals that are strategically pursued over time, such as in the conventional form of partisan political factions or the political-economic sense of a conscious emancipatory politics (Lunt and Livingstone 1992:169). There is little evidence, though, that disparate consumers consciously set out to transform American society by shopping for bric-a-brac or any other commodities. Nevertheless, bric-a-brac and other apparently innocuous material objects were invested with symbolic significance that obliquely commented on broader social context, expressed consumers’ individual and societal aspirations, reproduced various structural ideologies, and even criticized social inequality. Overwrought observers sometimes reduce the modern West to an Orwellian column of shoppers for whom meaningless material style has replaced substantial values, cultural identities, or collective politics (e.g., Ewen 1988; Packard 1957). In various times, Coney Island, the Montgomery Ward catalog, Disney World, or Toys“R”Us have indeed had a dimension of pure escapist detachment from objective inequalities. Yet it is shortsighted to imply that in the last century or so the masses simply have eschewed collective interests in favor of a trip to the mall. The meaning of even the most innocuous object reflects the tensions between producers and consumers, elite and disenfranchised, and many other contradictory social relationships. On the other hand, it probably is going too far to suggest that consumption has provided a concrete alternative to the existing polity; that is, despite the powerful, shared values reflected in widespread consumption, there is not a “consumer state” in which our collective social interests and values are derived from consumption. The postmodern suggestion that consumption is how people basically fabricate their own identities is even more problematic: if consumer goods did indeed provide the means to become whatever we wished, it is unclear why most of us chose these particular social circumstances.

Any object whose meaning is disputed has some “politicized” symbolism, so it is critical to probe the political consequence of various consumption patterns and illuminate the social conditions that consumers negotiated with particular sorts of things. Like all material culture, bric-a-brac from West Oakland shaped, reflected, accentuated, and raised its consumers’ social consciousness in various recognized and unexpressed forms, providing a circuitous yet utterly politicized commentary on American society. This vision of material politicization assumes that household consumption is worth studying because its constant negotiation of conflicting personal, collective, institutional, and state interests has a broad social influence that often went unrecognized by individual consumers.

THE MORALS OF BRIC-A-BRAC CONSUMPTION

MORALS AND MATERIALISM IN THE PARLOR

From about 1850 to the eve of the First World War, the primary battleground over consumer morals was the “parlor” (Grier 1988:64). The parlor was a public household space designated for more-or-less orchestrated social activities ranging from visits to club meetings. Some antebellum and even colonial homes had similar spaces, but prior to the mid-19th century, few Americans stocked one room with expensive furnishings and then dedicated it to relatively
superfluous activity, so such formal spaces were uncommon. Unlike their predecessors, Victorian ideologues were almost uniformly dedicated to the notion that a showpiece social space was essential to genteel identity.

Ideologically the parlor was a material manifestation of a household’s values, and this thinking was extended to the rest of the home. In this sense, the parlor is likely most important as an intellectual concept that stressed the implication of household material culture on values; a household was not compelled to have a dedicated space or universally subscribe to dominant parlor-decorating codes to be influenced by parlor-making ideologies. Indeed, most communities included diverse architectural forms that varied in their intent or capacity to accommodate a space expressly planned as a public room. West Oakland, for instance, was dominated by two basic types of modest wood frame homes that Paul Groth and Marta Gutman refer to as “Informal workers’ cottages” and “Almost-polite houses” (1997:33). The workers’ cottages were constantly modified vernacular creations that paid little attention to dominant design codes and instead answered their residents’ specific utilitarian and spatial needs. These homes had no parlor room per se, but of course a room could be devoted to social activity. It was unlikely, however, that formal socializing was any room’s sole function; most of these structures originally had only three rooms with little spatial specialization, and even with additions the homes remained cramped (Groth and Gutman 1997:44-49). The Almost-polite houses, in contrast, paid more attention to fixed styles and household spatial, decorative, and sanitary ideologies. Such homes borrowed from dominant Victorian codes for spatial specialization and first appeared in West Oakland in the 1870s (Groth and Gutman 1997:53). These five- or six-room homes ideally included a formal parlor space, though it sometimes served as a joint family room and parlor or even as a makeshift sleeping space.

THE AMBIGUITY OF BRIC-A-BRAC

Victorian household values were registered by material objects with varying degrees of symbolic clarity: for example, Bibles clearly evoked religious morals of some sort, but mass-produced bric-a-brac usually had considerably less clear associations. Consumers’ attraction to bric-a-brac—and many ideologues’ apprehension of the same trinkets—revolved around this ambiguous and evocative symbolism. The standard view of material symbolism is that an object represents some circumscribed meaning that is self-evident in a more-or-less shared social context. A Bible in a Victorian parlor represented religious values, even though there is some flexibility in the precise meaning of “religious values.” Bric-a-brac, though, usually was not intended to represent anything socially or historically specific. Instead, these objects evoked ambiguous sentiments about many significant yet far-ranging and ill-defined social practices.

This notion of symbolism is somewhat at odds with the standard premise that goods are consumed because they publicly display social identity or standing. Thorstein Veblen’s (1899) classic formulation of conspicuous materialism posited that things were consumed by a “leisure class” to publicly address society and display social identity, so a good’s “use value” rested on its capacity to display social prestige or some clearly defined social identity. Obviously bric-a-brac was meant to be literally displayed, but it is critical to avoid the assumption that such goods were consumed so that such display would instrumentally “communicate” some distinct meaning about the consumer to others. In the case of the aristocratic figurine pictured in “Inchoate Sentiments” (see sidebar), for instance, precisely what was the clearly defined symbolism its
INCHOATE SENTIMENTS

Bric-a-brac extended the flexible symbolism of all material culture to its extremes. Knickknacks did this by featuring ambiguous motifs that were intended to be evocative, rather than straightforward representations. A typical example of this sort of evocative symbolic ambiguity is a figurine recovered at 830 Linden Street. This 2-3/4-inch unpainted porcelain figurine depicts a stoic, mustached male who is wearing a cap and flowing outer garment with a powder horn draped over his shoulder. The outer garment is suggestive of a doublet and overtunic, apparel that was common in Europe from the 14th to 16th centuries, and the cap is loosely reminiscent of a Renaissance-era Tudor cap. Yet the social symbolism of the figurine remains elusive because these design elements are at best only suggestive and idealized Renaissance renderings. A considerable volume of mass-produced bric-a-brac depicts historical motifs such as this that loosely refer to an idealized activity or romanticized period, rather than a concrete individual or event. Many figures like this one do not really represent any precise historical period: The figurine’s garb, for instance, is sufficiently vague that he might well represent any moment from the medieval period to 18th century. The actual activity the figure represents is itself unclear, although the powder horn and finery intimates that he is an aristocratic hunter. His well-groomed mustache and obvious Western clothing imply that he is European, but beyond this relatively nebulous identity his specific ethnic and cultural reference—if there actually was one at all—is unintelligible.

Trying to simply “make sense” of such objects in the terms of actual historical referents, dominant styles, depicted activities, or original cost is problematic, because these trinkets usually were not intended to represent anything concrete. Certainly a Victorian consumer or contemporary archaeologist might articulately interpret the aristocratic Linden Street figure as, for instance, an evocation of European elite heritage, a celebration of now-lost male sport, or a display of consumer “taste.” Yet the basic attraction of such objects is that they did not necessarily represent any specific or clearly defined association; indeed, they could simply evoke pleasant yet inchoate sentiments about a romanticized past, Western cultural and racial roots, masculinity, aristocratic behavior, or any other number of things.

This porcelain figurine reflects the symbolic ambiguity typical of mass-produced bric-a-brac. Historical-themed figures such as this commonly featured elements like the cap, powder horn, and outer garment that did not clearly represent any specific moment, and the actual activity to which the figure refers is itself unclear. This figurine was recovered from an early 1880s home at 830 Linden Street (Privy 4281).

possession expected visitors to grasp? Rather than assume its meaning to be public, self-evident, and defined by dominant stylistic mavens and viewers—which is how Veblen and many historical archaeologists tend to see goods, its symbolism was equally “private,” abstract, and shaped by its consumer. Many consumers certainly did wish to impart their “style,” “morality,” or “status,” but these terms were such malleable abstractions that they could entail quite different things to different people. Symbolically ambiguous objects allowed their parlor-making consumers to daydream about their own identities and society, not simply to showcase who they were (or wished to be) to others. Many mass-produced goods were consumed for such “private” household symbolism as much as for their ability to project some identity to outsiders.
Bric-a-brac sometimes featured quite familiar historical motifs (e.g., Robinson and Leadbeater ca. 1885), yet even these seemingly familiar faces and personages had somewhat ambiguous meanings. Perhaps the most popular of these historical figures, Abraham Lincoln, was represented by a Linden Street artifact that reflects the complex and dynamic historicizing that went on in America following the Civil War. Abraham Lincoln was among the most common characters reproduced in bric-a-brac ranging from chromolithographs to statuary to molds of his hands or death mask (e.g., Castelvecchi 1885:6). Much like the intensively memorialized George Washington, Lincoln symbolized a vast range of America’s most cherished values, but Lincoln had particular pertinence in the late-19th century wake of the Civil War and Emancipation. Chromolithographs of Lincoln depicted him in a range of quite charged roles as the Great Emancipator, the healer of the national rift, and an archetype of the self-made man. A vast volume of public Lincoln statuary was erected in the immediate aftermath of the war, yet these public, permanent, and monumental commemorations painted a somewhat more guarded civic picture of the President than the flood of Lincoln chromos. Kirk Savage’s (1997:65) study of public statuary in 19th-century America recognizes that statues’ intended permanence made them poor mediums to represent a given moment’s most passionately contested subjects; instead, statues were intended to pose an eternal symbolic resolution and cast a subject in a timeless pose. Nevertheless, much like bric-a-brac, statues’ aesthetics were designed to impart somewhat ethereal personality attributes like strength, wisdom, and achievement through aesthetic devices such as gesture, expression, adornments, and physical pose (Savage 1997:66). In the 1870s, for example, most public statues of Lincoln smoothed out his gaunt frame; they typically gave him more heroic garb than that he wore in his lifetime; and sometimes they placed him standing over a once-enslaved and now-deferent African American being freed by the Great Emancipator. Savage (1997:65) notes that in these guises Lincoln was the public symbol of Emancipation in the 1860s and 1870s, when most public statuary representing Emancipation’s still-unfolding history depicted African Americans alongside Lincoln in subservient poses. Often Lincoln would be posed with props such as the Emancipation Proclamation or a pen, devices that alluded to his role in Emancipation and reflected how commemorators immediately after his assassination saw Lincoln’s legacy firmly linked to Emancipation. This aesthetic underscored the wisdom of the great President and some Americans’ optimism about the end of slavery, though it said little or nothing about African Americans’ humanity or their own struggle for liberation. Yet when Reconstruction collapsed in the 1870s, Americans set to reestablishing conventional black-white racial relations and swiftly dispensed with the optimism that freedom augured an anti-racist society. This transformation in social and racial mood had an impact on subsequent Lincoln statuary, which dispensed with the figures of African Americans and aesthetic devices like scrolls; instead, Lincoln standing alone and unadorned became a symbol representing the Union’s preservation, a wise moral compass that guided the nation through its greatest menace (Savage 1997:122-124). His role in Emancipation quite quickly became subsumed to other features of his biography that conformed more readily to Americans’ prevailing mood.

A Linden Street figurine reflects this fresh post-Reconstruction vision of Lincoln. In the mid-1880s, Irish-born railroad collector Patrick Barry, his wife, Ellen, and a daughter lived at 818 Linden Street in a flat adjoining their tenants. The two households apparently shared a privy that was filled in about 1887 and included a black-glazed redware figurine of Lincoln broken just above the knees (Figure 4.2). The figurine’s circular base contains a rectangular placard that reads “LINCOLN,” and the figure’s feet are slightly askew and knees bent in a conventional statuary pose intended to evoke dynamism in a forever-immobile object. The lost portions of the figurine may have had any number of gestures, poses, or accessories, but the
modest remaining portion of the figure says a surprising amount about its symbolism. The space around Lincoln's feet is simply molded ground; this Lincoln was not surrounded by a freed slave, suggesting that the figurine reflects shifts in post-Reconstruction Lincoln symbolism. The figurine also does not contain remnants of flowing cloaks or classical clothing, elements that post-war sculptors often added to Lincoln to render his haggard frame and inelegant attire “heroic” in the terms of 1860s-1870s aesthetic conventions (Savage 1997:69). The Linden Street Lincoln is apparently wearing modest trousers and boots, much as Lincoln himself actually did, and at least the remaining portions of the figurine do not refer to Lincoln’s role in Emancipation. This was in keeping with 1880s statuary conventions that stressed “realism” and the power of personality over idealized characterizations and contrived physical representations.

Such realism was reflected in a prominent Lincoln monument completed in Chicago in 1887 (Savage 1997:122). The Chicago statue depicted Lincoln standing alone before a chair, without accompanying devices such as scrolls, and it placed him in relatively accurate period clothing. This depiction suggested Lincoln had just risen to speak to the statue’s viewers, his hair somewhat disheveled, his clothes rumpled, but his gaze solidly set forward: This sort of figure displayed no clear historical judgment but instead stressed ambiguous personality attributes that a knowledgeable audience could connect to their notion of Lincoln’s symbolism and place in history. Discarded the same year as the Chicago monument was unveiled, the Linden Street Lincoln figurine appears to reflect a similar vision of Lincoln as a powerful personality more clearly allied with wisdom and morality than Emancipation.

Conceding African Americans a material representation in public space or a parlor was akin to confirming their newly won citizenship or even implying their genuine rights, and no consumers devoted to white superiority were likely to make either concession willingly. Newly arrived immigrants who were themselves subject to racism and xenophobia were among the most likely parties to object to public African American representations. For instance, in the 1880s a sculptor submitted a design for a New York statue that depicted a kneeling slave alongside Lincoln, but in 1890 the New York Times reported that the design had been rejected because “the figure of a negro in a public monument would arouse the resentment of the Irish citizens” (Savage 1997:81-82). Irish immigrants were marginalized by racism themselves and often associated with highly stigmatized blackness. Consequently, depictions of African Americans would seem particularly unlikely motifs among Irish Americans like Linden Street residents Patrick and Ellen Barry. Lincoln alone was a relatively “safe” symbol, but when depicted alongside an African American or some other highly charged motif the object posed more complicated historical and racial symbolism. The figurine of Lincoln as an ambiguous moral force and fount of American wisdom likely had allure to those immigrants who aspired to citizen privileges, and Lincoln was sufficiently ambiguous to represent anything from Republican partisanship to nationalist wisdom to their consumers’ willing embrace of American history.
The Barry family’s ca. 1887 refuse, found in Privy 4234 at 816-818 Linden Street, may reflect the material aspirations of this working-class family. Among the plain white ceramics, glasses, and tumblers are display items such as the fancy etched glass decanter and the large scalloped fruit bowl.

The redware Linden Street Lincoln figure suggests more about aspirations than genuine material affluence. By the 1880s, redware had long been a passé medium for virtually any ceramic production except flowerpots, and it was an uncommon and generally inexpensive form in decorative figurines. The Lincoln figure’s cost was not necessarily a critical factor in shaping the object’s meaning, but in dominant decorative ideology, redware was not a particularly desirable medium. The rest of the assemblage, however, does at least suggest some aspirations to the material trappings of gentility. The assemblage included four flowerpots, a partial porcelain figurine, table glass including an etched decanter, and a preponderance of white-bodied ceramics that presented a relatively uniform table assemblage. Ultimately much of the bric-a-brac recovered from working-class and otherwise marginalized contexts like that on Linden Street suggests more about its consumers’ aspirations for self-determination and citizen privileges than their actual social and material advance. Especially for newly arrived immigrants and Americans subordinated by racism or poverty, apparently innocuous household goods provided a modest but significant mechanism that situated them in relation to the ambiguous genteel mainstream. Household material culture was significant in Victorian eyes because it symbolically idealized consumer identity, and bric-a-brac’s rich symbolism provided a foothold for many Americans aspiring to the social and material prospects of consumer affluence.
“THAT MIDDLE STATE”: DESIRE, AMBITION, AND BRIC-A-BRAC

The powerful desire for material things has long plagued and baffled consumer society’s critics, yet most critics have attempted to impose behavioral codes and evade the thorny question of why people want goods at all. In 1860, for instance, Florence Hartley aspired to discipline the women gathered at window displays and suppress the hedonism supposedly unleashed by department stores. Without contemplating what drew Americans to consumer space, Hartley concluded that a “lady who desires to pay strict regard to etiquette, will not stop to gaze in the shop window. If she is alone, it looks as if she were waiting for someone else; and if she is not alone, she is victimizing some one else, to satisfy her own curiosity” (1860:112-113). Lelia Hardin Bugg’s The Correct Thing for Catholics echoed that it was improper to “make a tour of the shops, pulling down and examining goods, pricing articles, and taking up the time of the salesmen, when there is no intention of buying anything” (1891:137). Neither observer could actually understand material desire, so they simply hoped to regulate it.

This sort of conservative counsel became quite exceptional in the late-19th century. As Hartley and Bugg vainly beseeched their readers to quell consumer desire, marketers introduced a variety of mechanisms that encouraged consumers’ imagination, anticipation, and desire. Late-19th-century department store planners busily erected stunning plate glass window scenes to entice consumers to imagine the symbolic possibilities of goods, and they organized floor spaces so that consumers would wander and purchase goods from impulse. Theodore Dreiser’s novel Sister Carrie described the distinctive experience such consumer spaces fostered: “There is nothing in this world more delightful than that middle state in which we mentally balance at times, possessed of the means, lured by desire and deterred by conscience or want of decision. When Carrie began wandering around the store amid the fine displays, she was in this mood” (1900:67).

Consumers like Sister Carrie negotiated the tensions between material desire and restraint, suspended in a “middle state” in which consumers weighed need and moderation against desire and pleasure. Colin Campbell (1987:86) traces the roots of this “desiring mode” to the 18th century, concluding that consumers experience a “state of enjoyable discomfort” in which wanting is itself as pleasurable as possessing an object (cf. Baudrillard 1988:24). Where Veblen posed the value of a good as its capacity to display identity, Campbell argues that use value resides in a good’s capacity to accommodate a consumer’s aspirations and imagination. It is essentially irrelevant whether or not objects satisfy their consumers’ oft-grandiose expectations or inchoate daydreaming; certainly commodities rarely if ever produce radical changes in peoples’ lives, but what is significant is the persistent belief that goods harbor or forebode such change. Rather than experience perpetual disappointment with goods, most consumers effortlessly project their imaginations onto new things.

Conservative ideologues rapidly reacted to the desires they believed were unleashed by consumer space and household goods. For instance, a chorus of physicians, religious figures, and authority types argued that women were particularly prone to psychological and medical conditions inflamed by shopping’s intense emotional stimulation (Abelson 1989). Philosopher Max Nordau argued in 1897 that shopping’s detrimental emotional arousal was common to most materialism: “The present rage for collecting, the piling up in dwellings, of aimless bric-a-brac . . . appear[s] to us in a completely new light when we know that [French psychologist] Mangan has established an irresistible desire among degenerates to accumulate useless trifles” (Saisselein 1984:63). In his sensationalized titled tome The Nervous Housewife, Abraham Myerson sounded a similar warning that materialism posed a substantial threat to moral order, social
structure, and the personal discipline of both men and women. He observed that, “what a man considers riches in anticipation is poverty in realization. Here again we deal with the mounting of desire” (Myerson 1920:117). Myerson voiced a common apprehension of ever-burgeoning material abundance when he observed “That society of all grades is restless with the desire for luxury seems without doubt . . . Modern capitalism reaps great wealth by developing the luxurious, the spendthrift tastes of the poor. It would be a peculiar poetic justice that will make that development into the basis of revolution” (1920:124).

Myerson may well have been standing at the heart of a revolution in the 1920s, when American identity became more closely linked to material consumption than faith, nationalism, ethnicity, or other once-unchallenged seeds of identity (Agnew 1990; Susman 1984). In 1929 for instance, Robert and Helen Lynd were somewhat taken aback when the “Middletown” (i.e., Muncie, Indiana) newspaper decreed that “The American citizen’s first importance to his country is no longer that of citizen but that of consumer. Consumption is a new necessity”’ (1929:88). The Lynds understood that this sentiment would have been quite remarkable a half-century before. Yet if Myerson and the Lynds were witnessing a “revolution,” it was an oddly conservative one that focused Americans’ “rights” on consumption, and not on civil, political, or material privileges that could only be secured through transformations in class structure, labor relations, or social inequality. Ronald Edsforth (1987), for instance, attributes 1920s autoworkers’ labor activism to working-classes’ desire to bolster their economic ability to purchase goods and preserve their leisure time, not a deep-seated zeal to unseat producer elite. In this sense, by the New Deal Americans were “fighting” to preserve their right to buy things, not to defend God, Country, and other ideological icons that stood at the heart of American identity a half-century before. Like many Americans, Abraham Myerson was apprehensive that unachievable consumer desires and unrelenting poverty threatened to produce class warfare, but the United States was not subsequently visited by class upheaval spearheaded by restless shoppers. If anything, the promise of consumer culture’s impending economic and material bounty may well have subdued class unrest. Even in the depths of the Depression, marginalized Americans often submitted to staggering social and material inequality under the assumption that affluence was possible for any American with the appropriate discipline, ambition, morals, and good fortune.

The groundwork for such widespread faith in American affluence was laid in the late 19th century. Despite all the moral weight of late 19th-century material discourses, Victorian Americans celebrated affluence much more than they lamented it. The Protestant ideology that shaped most household philosophizing in the second half of the 19th century was not really opposed to consumption in the first place, although religious and consumer ethics were diametrically opposed. Many Americans cherished the ideological notion of “affluence,” which in various quarters implied national might, industrial domination, widespread consumer prosperity, genteel middle-class culture, and white racial superiority. Affluence was satisfying to so many Americans because its proponents (especially in marketing) left the concept strategically undefined and simply evoked a wide range of hopeful but ambiguous emotions linked to consumption. Advertisers likely delivered the most resounding declaration of affluence, constructing a profoundly influential but completely distorted vision of American life and the power of material things. Much like bric-a-brac itself, advertising was what Roland Marchand (1985:xvii) calls a Zerspiegel, a mirror that distorts and selectively represents its subjects’ true image. Advertising seized upon salient popular ideologies—ranging from American industrial prowess to white superiority—and dramatized how such “values” were reproduced and affirmed by the consumption of particular goods.
The implications made by advertisers and other champions of affluence were made particularly believable by the genuine profusion of goods displayed in department stores, mail order wish books, and cities and towns where wealthy Victorians lived alongside scores of aspiring gentility. Department store magnates saw their new marketing spaces as “palaces” that provided a stunning architectural confirmation of bourgeois affluence, the onward march of democracy and Western civilization, and the educational role of consumption. John Wanamaker, for instance, built striking stores in Philadelphia and New York that included auditoriums, marble-columned courts, organ players, casts of classical sculpture, commissioned murals, and several hundred paintings purchased from the Paris salons (Saisselin 1984:45-46). Comparable department stores were in most American cities by the 1880s. In 1897, for example, English traveler George Steevens noted that the

Emporium—the Bon Marche of San Francisco, and one of the numerous biggest stores on earth that this country boasts—finds it conducive to trade to woo its patrons by a band of music perched on a pedestal in the midst of a restaurant, and under a dazzlingly illuminated glass dome. It also has the happy idea of setting up a balustrade in the midst of one of the important departments, over which you can watch golden-haired maidens receiving cash and popping back change into gilt pneumatic tubes [1897:231-232].

For those consumers who did not venture into such consumer palaces, bric-a-brac also was available in a score of “notion stores,” chains, mail order catalogs, and as gifts from merchants (on notion stores in Oakland, see Anthony 1939:7).

THE ABUNDANT INTERIOR:
AFFLUENCE, CLUTTER, AND ECLECTICISM IN BRIC-A-BRAC

Affluence certainly found a stunning material expression in the archetypal Victorian parlor replete with high-style furniture, mass-produced goods, art objects, and collectibles. Attacks on conspicuous luxury were not particularly common before the turn of the century, because many Americans began to entertain the notion of class mobility for the first time. An 1887 etiquette manual noted that a

...great deal has been written by interested parties on the corruptibility of riches; about money being the root of evil; that riches do not make happiness; that poor people are happier than rich; that gold is a curse, and the cause of crime, &c. Now all this looks very well in theory, but who among my readers does not know that the very opposite is the result, and those who talk so much and preach so persistently on the curse of gold, are themselves very anxious to secure as much of this root of evil as possible for themselves and their families. Money is not a curse, but a blessing. ... Poverty is the curse of the world [Union Publishing 1887:12-13].

Margaret Sangster echoed this sentiment when she remarked that “It is the fashion now to abuse rich men, and nag at them, and it makes many who are rich afraid of making any display; but comfort yourselves with the thought that it is righteous and just and proper that you should have all the comforts and luxuries your riches can procure you, so long as they are not demoralizing luxuries” (1897:409). These bold celebrations of affluence created a fertile environment for marketers, consumers, and critics of bric-a-brac alike.
The boldest celebrants of consumer affluence pioneered the stereotypical Victorian aesthetic in which an eclectic profusion of goods covered the complete household space. In 1897 a writer in *The Boston Cooking-School Magazine* enthused that “There cannot be too many beautiful buildings, statues, or paintings in the world, nor too much real taste, ornamental design, or artistic furnishing in our homes” (Parker 1897:8). Two decades earlier, though, decorative writer Clarence Cook had criticized the material glut in such rooms, noting that the “New-York parlor of the kind called ‘stylish,’ where no merely useful thing is permitted, and where nothing can be used with comfort, is always overcrowded” (1878:100). Cook was an early censor of superficial style’s victory over genuine functionality, yet he still argued that household spaces should be distinctive representations of the family’s personality. The notion of a highly personalized eclectic interior would come under withering attack by the turn of the century and eventually transform household decorative ideology. In Victorian discourse, “eclectic” typically referred to interiors that evinced no clear decorative scheme, particularly spaces favoring decorative volume and texture over functional simplicity. In the 1880s and 1890s, a stream of style mavens became increasingly critical of objects like bric-a-brac that had no genuine functional utility. These thinkers promoted “rational” interior designs that hearkened back to sparer, symmetrically balanced colonial precedents. This and related backlashes against eclecticism became the dominant thread of household ideology after about 1900, when the notion of decorative “harmony,” the resurrection of historical styles, and the rejection of superfluous ornamentation prompted sparer interior ideals (Brooks 1994:23-25).

A ca. 1885 privy at 654 Fifth Street provides one of the most ornate and eclectic examples of abundance in the West Oakland assemblages (Privy 900). The parcel containing a story-and-a-half residence had been owned by the Mann family since 1862 and included a variety of family members as residents until about 1885. New Hampshire-born brothers Benjamin and Frederick Mann were living in the home with Frederick’s wife Eunice and her three children in the late-1870s, and the brothers tried their hands at various ventures including farming, mining, speculating, and banking. The 1880 U.S. Census recorded the 53-year-old Frederick as a miner and his brother Benjamin as a “capitalist,” suggesting their similar entrepreneurial ambitions. By the time Eunice moved out of the house in about 1885 and discarded much of the house’s contents into the privy, both Frederick and Benjamin had died (the former around 1883 and the latter on New Year’s Eve 1884).

The Mann family privy contained a stylish assemblage of tableware including costly matching porcelains, decorated glassware, an earthenware candelabra, candlesticks, and specialized vessel forms such as spoonholders and gravy boats (Figure 4.3). The presence of a large matched set as well as coffee beans in the privy strongly suggests that the household entertained guests for both meals and coffee drinking. After eating at such a well-appointed dining table, the family likely retired to a parlor space decorated with Victorian bric-a-brac. The Manns’ assemblage included a variety of cut, etched, and painted stemware, a rather distinctive cobalt blue candlestick holder with a dolphin-shaped pedestal, cut glass lampshades, and several figurines and vases. These were all stylish Victorian goods, but by the 1880s few decorative ideologues would have counseled the household to use this array of objects together in a single assemblage. In fact, when writers criticized “eclecticism” and over-filled Victorian parlors, they were reacting to consumers like the Manns who displayed a rich range of stylistically and colorfully discordant household goods alongside each other. The otherwise enthusiastic household decorator Clara Parker warned against such decorative incongruity when she concluded that “In all things—walls, carpets, chairs, sofa-pillows, bric-a-brac, fancy-work—let there be not
loud or startling effects, a jumble of striking combinations” (1897:9). In contrast, consumer champions like the New York store Sypher and Company more eagerly celebrated consumers’ new prospects, concluding that “it is impossible that the old poverty of house-furnishing should ever come back. We shall no longer have rows of houses all alike inside... Now we have individual tastes shown in our furniture, and they will be shown more and more as the means of gratifying them become more common” (1885:31-32). Designers and ideologues alike championed many specific models, but they agreed on the ideal of “uniformity”; i.e., the appearance that the room or house was furnished in a coordinated design (Grier 1988:30). This design scheme was ideally executed in one moment, which implied more expense than gradual, piecemeal decoration that covered several seasons or integrated passé items.

Much bric-a-brac was artistic or exotic, symbolism that was fundamentally a statement about consumers, not the place where the objects originated or the culture and time to which they referred. In the heady optimism of late-19th-century America, exotic bric-a-brac was a confirmation of nationalist power and affluence, a privately possessed verification of Western domination. The popular description of exotic peoples and places was itself ambiguous, ideological, and often racist: for example, American consumers’ vision of “Turkish style” was recreated in numerous households’ “Turkish corners” (cf. Brooks 1994:20), but that style had virtually nothing to do with Turkish history and culture. Typical of such exoticized decorative ideology was a 1903 household manual describing an “Oriental Scheme for [a] Smoking Den” that included a “cozy corner [which] has a Moorish crown” (Barnard, Sumner, and Putnam Company 1903:30). Few household ideologues actually plumbed the complexities of Westerners’ attraction to objects from other cultures and time, instead representing it as Americans’ distinctive curiosity. In 1885 the New York store Sypher and Company rhapsodized that Victorians
AFFORDABLE ART: PARIAN IN VICTORIAN PARLORS

The Manns' bric-a-brac included three objects of Parian ware, a popular decorative ceramic that was found in several West Oakland assemblages. In 1844 a technique was introduced that used alabaster or wax to mold statues more intricately than the molding process used to manufacture Staffordshire earthenware figurines (Briggs 1988:150). That year an English sculptor began to produce Parian ware, a bisque porcelain that used this molding process to render detailed and "lifelike" figurines and decorative objects. Parian had a look similar to marble, and a flood of English and American producers marketed it as "art" distinct from less detailed and cheaper earthenware or porcelain figurines. An 1846 English trade journal, for instance, noted that the potteries "attach very great importance to this material, as offering a valuable medium for the multiplication of works of a high order of art, at a price which will render them generally available" (Briggs 1988:150).

Parian was sufficiently expensive and uncommon that it would have been a distinctive object in an 1880s parlor. Parian had some symbolic distinction from most surrounding bric-a-brac because it was commonly marketed as an affordable objet d'art, rather than an indifferent commodity curio. Art in Victorian homes implied wealth and the elusive quality of aesthetic taste based on cultivation and education, but very few Americans could actually purchase or commission art for their parlors. Parian, though, blurred the boundary between art and commodity and provided a material means for aspiring gentility to apprehend art symbolically, socially, and as a collectible possession. Not surprisingly, the distinction between art and commodity was a distinction many genteel ideologues hoped to preserve rather than obscure. The snobbishness of artistic aesthetes was summarized in 1882 by Francis Marion Crawford, who concluded that "The eye, accustomed to the endless knickknack, bric-a-brac, and arabesque, can no longer follow the pure lines of a great statue, or grasp the drawing and the color of a master's painting" (1882:90-91).

The Mann privy included several examples of the popular decorative ceramic Parian, including this vase. Objects like this vase were marketed as art for genteel "middle-class" consumers, and their symbolism often borrowed from Classical art or more ambiguous and evocative motifs like this feminine hand.

Parian often reproduced classical motifs and paragons of Western art, and the examples featured in exhibitions often were truly artistic creations, but most mass-produced Parian included subjects that were little different from those cast in other ceramic types. The Manns’ privy, for instance, included a striking 8-inch-tall vase molded in the form of a female hand grasping a lily-bud vase. Alongside it in the privy assemblage was a 6-inch by 5-inch Parian plaque depicting a well-dressed woman with a bundle on her head, rake over her shoulder, and a goat at her feet. A third Parian object in the privy appears to be a lid molded with a bird’s likeness, but it is too fragmented to definitively identify the motif or form.
take a very great interest in other peoples and in other countries, an interest so great that it has affected our whole way of living; not only our houses show it, but our pictures, our amusements, our books, our newspapers, and our dress. In our houses we give our love of adventure free play, and like to be reminded at every turn, of the fact that America, big as is her territory, is but a small part of the world [1885:8].

Americans may well have had a “very great interest” in non-Western peoples, but little bric-a-brac contained substantially realistic references to contemporary colonized peoples. If anything, exotics from recognizable or still-living cultures posed some threat that an extinct, idealized, or utterly vanquished group (e.g., Native Americans) did not pose (cf. Stewart 1993:148). The hazard of the “Other” was neutralized by bric-a-brac that grossly caricatured or did not clearly refer to the realities of colonized peoples’ lives; i.e., bric-a-brac was intended to distance its American consumer from such realities and verify what they already “knew” about themselves and their society. Most American consumers only “knew” the foreign producers of exotics through popular culture, or they encountered these peoples in the caricatured representations in mass-produced goods, so exotic bric-a-brac was unlikely to foster any genuine appreciation of the late-19th-century colonial world.

The most common West Coast exotics came from China and Japan. Most Californians had some genuine exposure to Chinese immigrants (if not Chinese culture), but popular ideologues painted a powerful racist caricature of the Chinese. Popular caricatures of groups like the Irish, African Americans, and Chinese were sufficiently resilient, widely repeated, and advantageous to so many other groups that the racist caricatures often assumed the status of reality; for example, outsiders often assumed the veracity of depictions such as the happy, lazy black or the perpetually drunk Irishman.

The West Oakland assemblages contained a vast range of Chinese- and Japanese-manufactured objects, and some probably were consumed for functionality or price as much as their unspoken capacity to summon forth various visions of the Orient. Yet many of these goods were consumed for their decorative exoticism as much as their table utility or ready availability. The Chapman household at 828 Myrtle Street (Privy 3300/Pit 301), for instance, discarded five Japanese porcelain vessels along with a Chinese porcelain vessel, a likely Oriental motif art pottery ware, and the two chamber-pot figurines introduced at the outset of this chapter (see Figure 4.1). Household writers

---

**EXOTICISM**

Exoticism was central to late-19th-century visions of affluence. Since the 18th century, collectors had accumulated assemblages of goods from throughout the colonized and natural world, ranging from traditional craft goods to items from nature. Such goods were of course rare and difficult to acquire, so their accumulation and display by an erudite collector was a powerful ideological statement about elite collectors and their class power. Yet as the colonial world opened up over the 19th century, increasingly more exotic goods reached American consumers of modest means, and eventually bric-a-brac manufacturers themselves would produce goods depicting a wide range of colonial motifs. By 1885 Spelman’s Fancy Goods Graphic hawked a vast range of notions and remixed dealers, ”Everybody wants a collection” (Spelman 1885:137). The Spelman’s bric-a-brac catalog featured a typical range of exotic bric-a-brac from the colonial world, distant lands, and nature: Japanese and French fans, Egyptian Princess ceramic wall plaques, French Pug figurines, ceramic ”Baskets of Darkies” (i.e., African American figurines), and 18-inch decorated alligators were among the curiosities gracing the massive catalog. By the second half of the 19th century, the consumption of exotic things was no longer the province of a small aristocratic elite, and unique, mass-produced, and foreign-made exotics alike were quite common in the archetypally cluttered Victorian parlor.
often counseled home decorators to use Japanese material goods; for instance, Clarence Cook decreed just 10 years after Japan was opened to foreign trade that money is well spent on really good bits of Japanese workmanship. . . . A Japanese ivory-carving or wood-carving of the best kind, . . . one of their studies of animal life, or of the human figure, or of their playful, sociable divinities, pixie, or goblin, or monkey-man, has a great deal in it that lifts it above the notion of a toy [1878:102].

Cook’s description reflected how many observers reduced non-Western aesthetics to whimsical artistic styles divorced of their cultural footing and easily integrated and reinterpreted within genteel homes.

Several of the Chapmans’ Japanese vessels had absolutely no use-wear; for instance, one matching Kutani export cup and saucer show no clear saucer or cup base wear consistent with regular use. These vessels produced in northwest Japan feature colorful depictions of birds passing over leaning reeds, a traditional aesthetic representation of seasonal change (Figure 4.4). This illumination of Japanese tradition probably escaped the Chapmans, who more likely displayed these Oriental objects for their brilliant color, distinctive and exotic aesthetics, and insinuation of household worldliness. The bright Japanese palette would have been unlike the staid molding and overwhelmingly white-bodied ceramics favored by most period household ideologues. Cumulatively, the Chapmans’ distinctive chamber-pot figurines, bold but passé Rebekah-at-the-Well Rockingham teapot, and decorated table glass suggest that this house was decoratively eclectic. The Chapmans’ Rose Canton bowl likely was also a decorative vessel, since its elaborate overglaze scene is well-preserved, and even the household’s English vessels are elaborately decorated. For comparison, the Mann household at 654 Fifth Street was also eclectic and showy, but the Manns’ ceramic tableware were overwhelmingly stylish white-bodied vessels, and they had only two Chinese porcelain vessels.

The Chapmans’ attraction to this striking assemblage likely reflects a number of factors including the allure of exotic places and peoples. As a paperhanger Harry Chapman worked alongside house painters and likely developed a strong sense of decorative possibilities; so it is not surprising that he was attracted to the brilliant Japanese palette that was quite unlike the sedately white Victorian table. The Chapmans—in common with most American consumers—may have been attracted to exotic aesthetics in general, with no articulate interest in whether any given object was actually produced in a foreign place, had a cultural or historical story to tell, was displayed alongside similar sorts of items (e.g., Asian goods), and so on. For instance, a household at 1774 Atlantic Street discarded a stoneware dish in a molded lotus flower form, a typical motif in Japanese aesthetics (Well 7511). The vessel’s base, however, contains an unidentified mark that reflects the vessel’s probable origins in a West Coast art pottery

Figure 4.4. The Chapmans’ Asian ceramics. The Chapman household at 828 Myrtle discarded several brightly colored Japanese and Chinese ceramic items, some of which are pictured here (Privy 3300/Pit 3301).
(Figure 4.5). This vessel apparently went unused and has hints of rim wear that may reflect its display on edge, so it was an ornamental item much like the Chapmans’ bric-a-brac. It would appear that some households were less concerned with acquiring a “genuine” Japanese artifact than an object that incorporated exotic symbolism. A ca. 1906 feature at 812 Market Street contains a similar swath of colorful and exotic goods (Well 1703). Deposited in the wake of the earthquake, the Market Street assemblage includes colorful Victorian-style Majolica, a Chinese celadon vessel, a black-glazed refined redware teapot, and two Japanese ceramic vessels. While the assemblage did not include any figurines and only three flowerpots, it suggests a rich color palette and exotic styles similar to the Chapmans’ assemblage.

The ultimate exotic was a unique object, and many Victorians collected objects from nature or antiquity to display alongside their mass-produced bric-a-brac. The best evidence for such consumption in West Oakland comes from a privy at 768 Fifth Street deposited by the household of John and Katie Taylor and their teenage daughters (Pit 1753). The privy was filled in about 1884 with a relatively unremarkable assemblage of household refuse that included a small tea service and an assemblage of typical patent medicines, but alongside these objects nine prehistoric groundstone net weights were recovered. Their recovery in a discrete deposit indicates that they were discarded together during the formation of the pit fill and were likely collected by a household member. Clarence Cook was among the household writers who advocated display of such objects. He noted that a Victorian cabinet might be made a museum for the preservation of all the curiosities and pretty things gathered in the family walks and travels. The bubble-bottle of old Roman glass stirred in walking by one’s own foot in the ruined palace of the Caesars, and not bought in a shop; the Dutch drinking-glass, with the crest of William of Orange; the trilobites found in a New burgh stone-wall, or the box of Indian arrow-heads, jasper, and feldspar, and quartz picked up in a Westchester County field; bits of nature’s craft and man’s, gathered in one of these pendant museums, may make a collection of what were else scattered and lost, and which, though of little intrinsic value, and of small regard to see to, will often find its use in a house of wide-awake children [1878:101].

Such objects certainly were collected by enterprising West Oaklanders. For instance, in 1939 resident Fred D. Realey asked his readers of the West of Market Boys’ Journal if they remembered “when Shell Mound Park was an ancient village and when excavations were made of the mound. There were discovered numerous bones of Indians, shells, arrow and spear heads and other objects of interest that had been owned by the Indian tribes of other days” (1939:11). The park in nearby Emeryville became a well-known amusement center, and it is likely that some West
Oakland residents collected objects at this and other regional sites for their household assemblages. These net weights may well have been displayed alongside shells and similar objects taken from nature.

A ca. 1875 pit at 817 Market Street included several pieces of bric-a-brac and contained one of the project’s most unusual exotic items (Pit 3382). At the time the pit was filled, the residence was home to Charles Lufkin, a white Massachusetts-born lawyer and police inspector. Lufkin’s family and their boarders discarded a range of quite stylish decorative goods, including a Parian lid molded with the likeness of a sleeping cherubic figure, as well as two brightly painted porcelain figurines in colonial-style clothing. Alongside these items was recovered 150 beads that may have been discarded by dressmakers boarding with the Lufkins. These beads included three large translucent white beads known as “crackled white” that were made in 19th-century east and south Africa. Whether these beads were consumed as decorative curios or within normal beadwork is unknown, and their origins may well have been a mystery to the household members. Nevertheless, in a stylish genteel household that was sensitive to exoticism, such objects likely attracted some notice, even if they did not secure a spot in the parlor.

The bounds of exoticism stretched into prehistory and distant lands, and they also reached into nature. Victorian interiors often included a variety of goods taken from nature, such as unusual sea shells, dried wood, or taxidermed animals, and potted plants and flowers were customary items in genteel space. Much like the collection of goods manufactured by “primitive” peoples, Victorians’ consumption of natural objects was self-referential and likely reflects apprehension over the seemingly ever-widening divide between culture and nature. For some collectors, the placement of a strange shell under glass was verification of the Western world’s transcendent ability to explain the world, if not its triumph over nature. A flowering plant in their parlor essentially confirmed Man’s mastery over nature and a genteel householder’s cultivated ability to appreciate natural beauty. Other observers were apprehensive of a Victorian world of convoluted social conventions, hypnotic mass advertising, and ever-increasing social complexity, nostalgically seeing the nation ripped from its orderly traditional past and once-intimate relationship with “nature.” Their attraction to shells and flowers was more clearly based in an ideological sentiment for simplicity.

The West Oakland assemblages contained a vast quantity of shells, but most were either imported as food, like eastern oysters, or locally available, like abalone. The archaeological assemblages contain clearer evidence for the “display” of live animals. Some Victorians decorated their homes with taxidermed animals, but for those decorators unable to obtain a stuffed animal, live animals were a common alternative. The West Oakland assemblages included a minimum of 22 bird feeders or bird baths and at least one fish bowl. Fish bowls and glass bird feeders are atypical vessel forms that are often highly fragmented, and archaeologists rarely if ever expect to recover such objects, so these usually go unrecognized unless they are recovered intact, which is quite uncommon. The presence of marijuana seeds in a privy at 1774 Atlantic Street likely also reflects the presence of birds; bird feed often was laced with marijuana to induce more boisterous songbird performances. Bird feeders and cages clearly had symbolic significance. For instance, one woman remembered that in the aftermath of the 1906 San Francisco earthquake “all of a sudden we saw all these people coming, with no clothes on, bird cage and whatnot. See, San Francisco was burning” (Schwerin 1981:5). Naked San Franciscans fleeing the city with their birdcages was not likely a common sight, but it does suggest the significance of such goods.
MODELING PARLORS:
DECORATIVE AESTHETICS AND PULLMAN CARS

Victorian aesthetics were dynamic and eclectic, yet irresolute parlor-makers did not want for public spaces modeling appropriate decorative codes. Katherine Grier (1988:23) argues that dominant parlor aesthetics found their most influential expression in commercial spaces such as hotels, steamboats, and railroad cars that modeled the arrangement of goods in private household parlors. Between about 1830 and 1880, consumers could mull over and assess idealized parlors in public commercial spaces (e.g., hotels), exhibition models (e.g., the 1876 Centennial Exhibition), and department store displays. A string of exhibitions in Europe and the United States provided one of the most significant catalysts for elite Victorian decorative codes. After the Paris Exhibition of 1878 (Williams 1982), for instance, West Oakland’s stunning McDermott estate added exhibition goods to a high-style Victorian interior (Figure 4.6). The 10 August 1878 Oakland Times reported that

The rooms are beautifully frescoed in oil colors, and have elegant French furniture. The windows all have elegant silk hangings with rich curtains to match. In the parlor may be seen a Watteau painting of great value . . . [and] bric a brac from the Paris Exposition. . . . In another room a pair of screens, Chinese work, embroidered on white silk . . . birds, nearly a hundred in number are represented flying about and at rest among flowers [cited in Olmsted and Olmsted 1994:126-127].

For those consumers who could not venture to Paris, Wannamaker’s department store included 44 furnished period rooms designed to “enable architects and homemakers to study and select proper furniture and home adornments, and to enable them to individualize their homes from the mere commercial furnishing way” (Saisselin 1984:47). Perhaps the most interesting difference between these public and domestic parlors was that the former rarely included much bric-a-brac and almost never integrated photographs (Grier 1988:38). This suggests that many ideologists understood bric-a-brac to be a personal expression distinct from the dominant codes set out to regulate, for instance, furniture selection or carpet decoration in public spaces and household parlors alike (Figure 4.7). Some ideologists aspired to eliminate bric-a-brac altogether because of its eclecticism, but most model spaces apparently steered clear of this personalized dimension of household decorative ideology.

Railroad cars numbered among public parlor spaces in which many Americans experienced ideal parlor schemes. Many West Oaklanders worked for the railroads, so they likely worked and traveled in elaborately decorated Pullman railroad cars. Luxurious railroad cars became quite common by the 1850s, providing well-appointed men’s and women’s parlors as well as sleeping quarters that were adorned with the most stylish window curtains, paintings, upholstered chairs and benches, woodwork, and carpets (Grier 1988:47). George Pullman’s Pullman Palace Car Company was founded in 1867, and Pullman and his fleet of well-appointed cars became symbols of American luxury, affluence, and monopolism. In 1897 English traveler George Steevens wrote that the American “sleeping car is a miracle of luxury. All the wood is mahogany—or looks like it—and all the cushions are velvet. It looks as rich and solid as the British dining-room of the old school” (1897:258). Steevens rhapsodized that some trains had dining cars with “tables and comfortable seats ranged down it” at which “you are well served, well fed, and not heavily charged” (1897:259). Pullman cars also had “a drawing-room car with easy-chairs” and “the observation car,” providing a traveler a model Victorian household on the
Figure 4.6. The front parlor: an affluent Victorian public space. In the late 19th century, West Oakland’s own McDermott house provided a clear model for the exoticized and affluent Victorian parlor. Described as a "front parlor," this room was likely the household’s public social space, and it contained choice examples of most of the standard parlor goods. The room had, among other features, oil paintings, a grand piano, silk drapes, Chinese silk screens, and one quite prominent figurine of an eagle or bird of prey standing watch over the room. (Photo reproduced with permission from Vernon J. Sappers)

Figure 4.7. The rear parlor: a more familiar space. The McDermott House’s rear parlor contained numerous references to domesticity and family in the form of photographs, craft work, well-behaved dolls, flowers, and a bookcase from which an appropriately genteel patriarch might read to his family around the fire. (Photo reproduced with permission from Vernon J. Sappers)
rails (Steevens 1897:260). In the early 1890s, Pullman suggested that the introduction of luxurious material culture to lowly rail cars was intended to have the same “civilizing” effect as domestic parlors: “Take the roughest man, a man whose lines have always brought him into coarsest and poorest surroundings, and the effect upon his bearings is immediate. The more artistic and refined the mere external surroundings, in other words, the better and more refined the man” (Grier 1988:61).

Any well-appointed Victorian home had servants, and Pullman cars had a universally African American service staff that included many West Oakland residents. The cars had lavish material outfitting and were graced by efficient and cultivated African American service, but African American laborers faced many of the same daily personal and social indignations people of color faced throughout the country. Porters received good pay in comparison to most working-class labor, but the position consumed long hours, the work was difficult, and porters were subjected to standard anti-black racism (Spires 1994:207). For instance, George Steevens was loath to share his passage with class “inferiors,” but he was willing to accept some modest amount of working-class interaction in the dining car: “At the passengers’ table they eat quite correctly—except, of course, the blacks; it would be going too far to admit them” (1897:263).

**DOMESTICITY IN THE PARLOR**

The material factors that made Victorian parlors and bric-a-brac consumption are relatively clear: by the mid-19th century, cheap mass-produced furnishings had flooded the market, and an ever-expanding and newly moneyed “middle class” confirmed its new affluence by purchasing such goods. The social factors that made parlor-making possible or desirable, though, are more complicated than the objective economics that permitted factory growth, market expansion, and increasing disposable incomes. Fundamentally, parlor-makers’ consumption negotiated a basic tension between material affluence and social conservatism. Consumers were torn between, on one hand, an often-powerful desire to celebrate expanding American affluence and, on the other, a somewhat conservative and contradictory desire for a stable social order and domestic value code (cf. Grier 1988:2). Gentility and domesticity were a pair of ill-fitting ideologies: the former implied a household’s awareness of worldly high culture, affluence, and Victorian style, yet the latter evoked deep-seated familial ideology and the home as the fount of conservative values. In the face of such contradictions, objects were intended to show that a consumer could be both affluent and morally disciplined, both genteel and domestic.

The discrepancies in such ideology yielded predictably contradictory behaviors. Henry Ward Beecher, for instance, cautioned readers in 1853 that riches and goods were not the fount of satisfaction, a common lament of observers who were concerned that an embrace of materialism necessarily entailed a rejection of moral discipline and spirituality. Beecher, however, was loath to admit that his own store debts were so high during the 1850s that he was compelled to go on the lecture circuit and preach frugality to settle the earthly damages of his own consumer hedonism (Horowitz 1985:11). Underneath the veneer of conservative moralism, many Americans like Beecher nurtured an apparently inconsistent material desire that complicated their puritanical rhetoric.

**DIFFERENT EXPRESSIONS OF SOCIAL ASPIRATION**

Two Fifth Street households were headed by Central Pacific Railroad porters who certainly would have been well-acquainted with the decor of Pullman parlors. Between 1877 and 1882 porter Abraham Holland lived at 662 Fifth Street with widow Lucinda Tilghman, two of her children, and an African American domestic who, like Holland, was also boarding with the Tilghmans (Privy 900). Born about 1840 in Pennsylvania, Holland had served as a porter for the Central Pacific Railroad since at least 1874. Documentary evidence paints a
convincing picture of Holland as aspiring African American gentility. Holland apparently was part of the African American managed Sweet Vengeance Mine that was active in Brown Valley between 1848 and 1854. The operation persisted throughout the Gold Rush period and survived a host of white claim-jumpers to make some genuine claim to profitability: a local newspaper reported that in one week of April 1852 the mine produced “rich dirt, we have taken $1200,” and less than a month later it yielded another $1142 in a good week. The miners reportedly sent a significant share of these profits South to purchase the freedom of enslaved relatives.

Like many African Americans in the West, Holland may have been more devoted to personal material advance than the social climbing that typified the African American elite in the East. Genteel African American circles in the East were highly structured hierarchies defined by factors such as ancestry, rigid behavioral codes, education, and skin color. In the West, family heritage counted for little because no family could make a claim to long-term community status; likewise, Eastern color lines had far less consequence in the West (Gatewood 1993:138). East Coast African American newspapers devoted extensive attention to socializing among the “upper tens,” but West Coast papers spent little ink on such matters. Instead, these West Coast African American newspapers focused more on individual initiative and personal wealth, which are stereotypical Western values. Willard Gatewood (1993:138) suggests that African Americans in cities like San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Seattle were generally more firmly committed to the notion of a self-made man and class mobility than Easterners.

Nevertheless, there still remained quite aristocratic sentiments among African Americans in the West, and Holland may well have entertained these. At the end of the Civil War, California was among the 16 states with African American Masonic lodges, and by 1874 Holland had become a Mason. The Masons were among the most class-conscious, well-educated, and elitist of African American fraternal organizations, but San Francisco’s African American community was so small that class lines were much more fluid than in the East (Gatewood 1993:131, 212). Holland eventually ascended to the position of local Grand Master in 1878-1880, and he added to his Masonic membership a standard inventory of genteel African American social activities. In 1886, for instance, he was the president of Oakland’s Literary and Aid Society. This likely was a typical African American “culture club” whose educational and social missions ranged from reading classical literature to promoting Republican candidates (Gatewood 1993:214). Literary societies were by far the most common African American clubs, and most were directed by local elite. By 1891 Holland also was serving as director of the Colored Colonization Society of Fresno County, but the specific function of this organization is unclear. Holland also sent a son to college, which would have been routine among East Coast African American elite.

The material assemblage at 662 Fifth Street does not suggest the ostentatious materialism commonly associated with genteel Victorians. Abraham Holland certainly was a prominent figure in his community, and Lucinda Tilghman was financially comfortable if not wealthy, but their early 1880s privy contains a somewhat restrained genteel assemblage. The privy does not contain any bric-a-brac with the exception of two flowerpots. The household’s genteel ambitions are suggested by porcelain and white-bodied ceramics that were the height of 1870s table styles, as well as a host of grooming objects (e.g., combs, toothbrushes, and hair- tonic bottles), a French porcelain brush holder, and several pieces of jewelry. At least 57 glass chimney lamps were represented in the assemblage, as well as two porcelain candlesticks, a very high number of lighting artifacts compared to other West Oakland assemblages. The household had stylish material culture, but unlike the vastly more eclectic Mann privy at 654 Fifth Street, the Tilghman/ Holland assemblage does not have a preponderance of objects that are stylistically mismatched.
Even the ceramics that were not purchased as parts of matching sets were the same color and basic shapes, so they could easily have been used together. The Mann privy would have presented a more eclectic appearance in colors, motifs, and shapes and likely contained more “clutter” of typical parlor goods.

Pullman Palace Car Company porter James William Carter and his wife Nellie lived nearby at 668 Fifth Street (Well 953). Between 1889 and 1896, the household filled a 14-foot deep redwood-lined feature that likely was a well. The feature contained men’s, women’s, and children’s shoes, suggesting that a range of ages was included in the household. Like the Tilghman/Holland assemblage deposited roughly a decade earlier, the Carter assemblage does not reflect particularly pretentious parlor materialism. The Carter assemblage contains a ceramic assemblage dominated by relatively inexpensive white-bodied earthenware, a wide variety of decorated glass table vessels, and 50 saucers that include examples of almost every conceivable decorative type. While the assemblage included six redware flowerpots, several vases, and a clock, it did not include any figurines. Like the Tilghman/Holland household, the Carter household apparently favored a somewhat spare and coordinated interior.

Southern Pacific Railroad employees at 1774 Atlantic Street apparently had a considerably more eclectic and exoticized interior than that favored by the two porters’ households on Fifth Street. The Atlantic Street residence was home to several African American families and one Irish immigrant’s household who lived in the structure over short successive periods, so the assemblage cannot be reliably attributed to a specific household (Well 7511). The African American men living in the home were all Pullman porters, and the Irish family was headed by a Southern Pacific laborer and a laundress. Unlike the more restrained Fifth Street assemblages, the early to mid-1890s Atlantic Street assemblage includes a wide range of decorative goods. The assemblage contains five vases, including two 4-inch matching blue glass bud vases (Figure 4.8), a lotus motif stoneware dish, and two porcelain figurines, one of a colonial figure and the other apparently a jester.

This Atlantic Street assemblage’s visible household aesthetic may reflect one of many different material forms taken by class aspiration. Archaeologists tend to assume that class achievement takes the form of costly material assemblages, sidestepping the significant social dimensions of class and communal status. Class status was often secured through social relationships, such as fraternal memberships or church standing, and in Eastern and Midwestern African American circles such affiliations typically carried more status than wealth or materialism. Abraham Holland’s entrepreneurialism, Masonic membership, and social position in community culture societies strongly suggest aspirations to social mobility and some communal status. The Atlantic Street residents likely had similar ambitions, but they may have chosen to express those aspirations more visibly in objects than social networks. Willard Gatewood (1993:138) suggests that West Coast African Americans were more individualistic and materially ambitious than their peers in the Midwest or East, so African American status in cities like San Francisco was less vested in social networks and genteel performance than wealth. The Atlantic Street residents
may reflect this more visible West Coast material aesthetic, which certainly was not unique to African Americans. The Atlantic Street residents were marginalized by both racism and economic marginalization, like many of their West Oakland neighbors; yet subordinated consumers like these households sometimes purchased costly or distinctively showy material goods to distance themselves from the material realities and social stigmatization of penury. The son of a West Oakland grocery store owner pointed out that his father would “always have black people who liked goods things. . . . Everybody has priorities. You’d see poor Mexican people come in here, and they’d buy a good bottle of Spanish brandy. Everybody wants something they want once-in-a-while” (Mousalimas 1980:18). This marketer’s son recognized that economic determinism often does not explain consumer behavior, and he at least alluded to the often unspoken assumption that poverty and racial stigmatization go hand-in-hand. Bric-a-brac actually provides a relatively imprecise mechanism to evaluate class standing, but its presence often provides a sensitive insight into class aspirations. This visible material aesthetic does not reveal any self-evident ethnic “pattern,” but it is significant that African Americans entertained these ambitions at all. Certainly many African Americans went West precisely because they believed they might escape strenuous everyday racism and stand an improved chance of securing their own share of American affluence. What may be most critical about these African American bric-a-brac assemblages is not that they necessarily stand out from the remainder of the community but that they instead look quite similar. Ultimately these African American consumers were still subject to persistent and dehumanizing racism, but in the face of racism they used a range of social networks and material assemblages to secure some share of American affluence that was supposedly denied to them by blackness (see also Chapter 10).

RELIGION AND DOMESTICITY IN THE VICTORIAN PARLOR

In the mid-1880s, Daniel and Adelaide Robinson apparently secured a sewer connection for their home at 1814 Atlantic Street and began to gradually fill their privy with discard including glass tableware, tea or coffee equipage, and two figurines (Privy 6325). The Robinsons’ roughly 1,700-square-foot home included a parlor and dining room that suggest some pretensions to gentility, and the Nova Scotia-born Daniel Robinson eventually ascended from a carpenter to foreman with the Central Pacific Railroad. One of the Robinsons’ figurines was a 2-3/4 inch glazed porcelain figurine of a praying character now missing its feet and head (Figure 4.9). The figure has its hands clasped to its chest in prayer and is wearing a skirt tied off at the waist, a pious Victorian curio typical of the broadly religious imagery reproduced in bric-a-brac. A vast range of Protestant or ambiguously religious bric-a-brac was marketed to Victorians, and the moral discourses surrounding household material culture were saturated with various tenors of spirituality, but this figurine is the sole evidence of religious-themed bric-a-brac in the West Oakland assemblages.

Objects’ spiritual connotations figured prominently in many material discourses, reflecting the commonplace Victorian conjecture that a materialistic (and increasingly non-Protestant) society lacked a spiritual center. Between about 1840 and 1900, a host of ideologues championed an ostensibly unchallenged and universal Bible-based religion that Colleen McDannell calls “domestic Protestantism” (1992:172-173). These thinkers de-emphasized denominational divides and focused on the home as the social and material framework for Christian morals. Gothic Revival architects, for instance, emphasized the structural and disciplinary parallels between church and home design (McDannell 1992:162). Gothic Revival designers believed that the
home itself could shape Christian morals even if its inhabitants did not recognize the architecture’s influence. A vast range of mass-produced Christian material culture could be purchased to adorn pious Victorian homes, including paperweight crosses, ceramics with molded or printed religious scenes, and a variety of figurines of Biblical characters. Such material culture was intended to fortify deteriorating religious authority over the second half of the 19th century, and that erosion of church domination certainly had a direct relationship to the consumer culture that was simultaneously emerging (Curtis 1991). Consumer culture destabilized organized religion in the late-19th century, when many Americans began to see their individual (if not national) hopes invested in the material world more than the church. T.J. Jackson Lears (1983:6) argues that in an increasingly complex world that fostered feelings of “unreality,” Americans became absorbed in the immediate pleasures offered by consumer space and disillusioned by the deferred gratification promised by religion. In many quarters, the influence of the church deteriorated as Americans became disenchanted by the moral and personal self-discipline that religion demanded.

The paucity of self-evident religious objects in West Oakland is not necessarily a sign of eroded spirituality, rather, it may reflect a typical turn-of-the-century vision of a broadly defined spirituality that was not focused on conventional church discipline. In a community that included many different ethnic collectives, churches remained among West Oakland’s most important vehicles of class and ethnic identity. Nevertheless, some Oakland churches apparently followed the common trend to broaden their service to the community and become vehicles for community as well as individual morality. Several area churches, for instance, ran schools, and most orchestrated a full calendar of events like bingo, bake sales, clubs, and bazaars with varying degrees of charity and service involved (Olmsted and Olmsted 1994:129; Hattersley-Drayton 1997:196). In the face of a transforming church, many moralists fashioned a broadly based spirituality that loosened churches’ traditional rigorous discipline. Charles Richmond Henderson, for instance, was a Baptist clergyman who served as both the university clergyman and sociology professor at the University of Chicago after 1892 (Malone 1932:524). Henderson attacked pretentious materialism, noting that to “the student of history and economics the insulting excuses and praises of extravagance and barbarian ostentation are as exasperating as the spectacle itself is revolting when placed in contrast with the misery which is near it” (1897:259). In this vision, the morality of genteel Americans—indeed, their spiritual well-being—was itself blemished by their willing evasion of material inequality. This notion of morality cast all social and material practice as spiritually significant, extended the purview of faith beyond narrowly defined church activities, and threatened to erode the divisions between society’s elite and disenfranchised.

The ideological definition of women as nurturers and guardians of family morality was among the most prominent themes in 19th-century material discourses. New England moralists, for instance, were quite influential in championing the notion that the home was a familial, Christian space appropriately controlled by women (e.g., Beecher and Stowe 1869, 1873). The dilemma of constructing home as a separate feminine sphere after the mid-19th century was
that women were securing new and significant powers as household consumers in public space; to undermine that power, many patriarchal ideologues aspired to limit women’s roles to parenting, spousal support, and household labor. Consequently, consumer space offered women the opportunity to instill sound morality by appropriately furnishing their homes; however, that same consumer space offered up a host of inappropriate if not degenerate goods, as well as the alluring enticement of unbridled material desire (cf. McDannell 1992:172-173).

A chorus of moralists stubbornly aspired to convince women to willingly remove themselves from consumer space. For instance, The Household noted in 1887 that

> Mothers … will do your family and the world in general much more good by saving your strength and precious time for the improvement of your higher faculties, than by using them to furnish your table with fancy dishes and ornament your house with fancy work. . . . If we realize the true insignificance of worldly things compared with spiritual, it will probably not be spent in pursuit of worldly pleasure [1887:23].

Promoting flight from consumer space was at best naively romantic. Household authors generally sounded exaggerated warnings of the dangers posed by commodities, but popular writers typically hyperbolize concrete dilemmas to accentuate their threat. Americans have never been warm to the idea of utterly forsaking consumption, but eloquent writers recurrently summon forth long-standing anxieties about the social, personal, and spiritual effects of materialism (e.g., Ewen 1988; Frazier 1957; Packard 1957; Patten 1907; Thoreau 1854; Veblen 1899).

Many conservative ideologues believed that familial morality could be fostered by women who manufactured their own household decorative goods. Mary Elizabeth Sherwood (1881:120), for instance, advocated that women purchase a few modest commodities and place them alongside homemade craft goods. This was a common counsel by thinkers who viewed commercial space and home life as separate realms and were troubled by the use of mass-produced goods to symbolize domestic values (cf. Grier 1988:8). Sherwood, for instance, noted that “The poorest woman can now with very little money make a pretty room. . . . Good engravings, a little

---

**SPIRITUALITY AND RELIGIOUS BRIC-A-BRAC**

West Oakland families may well have seen their homes as spiritual spaces, despite the paucity of religious objects. As with all bric-a-brac, curation itself likely was quite rigorous, so few of these goods were actually discarded. It also is likely that some households had religious prints or objects such as Bibles that do not appear in archaeological assemblages. Robert and Helen Lynd (1929:100), for instance, noted that pictures were found in most 1920s working-class homes in Middletown. A household’s prints could have popular motifs, be hand-drawn by a family member, or, “if the family is of a religious bent, [include] colored mottoes: ‘What will you be doing when Jesus comes?’ or ‘Prepare to meet thy God.’” Jewelry crosses, rosaries, and religious symbols were recovered in West Oakland (see sidebar Chapter 6 “Crosses and Witch Balls”), but archaeological material culture suggests that Oakland’s residents expressed conventional religion in social and material forms other than household decorative goods. Excavations in comparable turn-of-the-century sites reflect a similar paucity of mass-produced religious bric-a-brac. For instance, archaeology in middle- and working-class Los Angeles households included no explicit religious motifs in mass-produced decorative goods (Costello et al. 1998; cf., Gums 1998; Mullins 1999; M. Praetzellis and A. Praetzellis 1990, 1992b), Chinese sites in the region include objects with mythical symbolism (e.g., Greenwood 1996:123-124), and secular artifacts certainly could have been invested with mythical or spiritual significance of some sort, but the flood of mass-produced religious trinkets available to Victorian consumers apparently did not find its way into West Oakland’s refuse.
cretonne, some knick-knacks made by herself, a few grasses, a growing plant, and an open fire are all that are needed to make a room pleasant and refined.” Such rooms fashioned from household handiwork were typically understood as the appropriate spaces for feminine expression. In 1898 Margaret Sangster argued that a home was fundamentally feminine because women had intensely emotional feelings for objects:

Does a man live who understands how a woman clings to her “things,” her furniture, her chairs and tables, her carpets and her curtains? . . . A woman knows how fond she grows of the old desk where she writes her letters, of the rocking-chair in which she sang lullabys to her babies, of the old clock which has ticked away the happy hours of all her life. Inanimate things, but so interwoven with the very woof of our emotions and very fibre of our hearts, that they seem as if endowed with sense and emotion [1898:304].

In contrast, George Santayana’s novel The Last Puritan described such a space in a Newport, Rhode Island, household from the disparaging perspective of a patriarchal Boston Puritan:

The room was littered with little sofas, little armchairs, little tables, with plants flowering in porcelain jars, and flowers flaunting in cut-glass bowls, photographs in silver frames, work baskets, cushions, footstools, books and magazines, while the walls were a mosaic of trivial decorations (not the work of deserving artists like those in his own house), but etageres with knick-knacks and bric-a-brac, feeble watercolours, sentimental engravings, and slanting mirrors in showy frames [1936:34].

In contrast to Margaret Sangster, Santayana’s character favored a “masculine” space expressed in less emotional works of art (Saisselin 1984:65-66).

The evidence for such idealized feminine parlors in West Oakland is, at best, very scarce. Some objects fashioned from fabric or otherwise fragile mediums would not survive archaeologically, but the West Oakland assemblages contain no clear evidence of homemade craft objects. Some mass-produced commodities in the assemblages do suggest a measure of creativity beyond simply arranging store-bought goods. For instance, among the material goods Sherwood and like-minded thinkers recommended were plants and flowers. It is infeasible to attribute all the material evidence of plants in the West Oakland assemblages to domesticated female homemakers, but the sites do contain numerous flowerpots and wall vases that indicate the presence of houseplants and flowers. The sites also contain a handful of picture frames that likely held family photographs. Nevertheless, there is no evidence to indicate that these householders were busily fashioning a stereotypical moral space from their own craft goods, and it is not clear how many consumers anywhere embraced such counsel. Indeed, Sherwood herself was unable to take her own advice, and her ostentatious lifestyle produced a terrible debt by 1890 (James, James, and Boyer 1971, 3:284-285). She was compelled to sell the stunning furnishings in her Manhattan home and retreat to a hotel while her husband was in Europe, and upon his return John Sherwood suffered a swift psychological decline and died in 1895.

Conservative domestic ideology never disappeared, but it also was never universally embraced. In 1910, for instance, Bertha June Richardson’s volume The Woman Who Spends proclaimed that “the time has come when women feel the need of study and training in the economics of consumption, otherwise known as the spending of money. . . . Today it is the woman who spends, and upon her rests the responsibility for the standards that govern the spending for the home and community” (1910:21-22). This was a vision of women’s position in public consumer space as empowering, not one of hysterical shoppers overcome by marketplace fervor.
“REAL” BRIC-A-BRAC

This ginger jar, found at the bottom of Annie Brady’s abandoned well at 812 Castro Street, may have been a decorative item (Well 968).

The consumption of “real” exotic goods (or quality craft objects like the Atlantic Street lotus dish) was sometimes considered an important antidote to the crudely executed flood of mass-produced goods. In 1898, for example, *The House Beautiful* noted, “if a poor man’s taste demands a statuette, he is unable to purchase one of Rodin’s marbles, and so attempts to satisfy his want by securing a [mass-produced] ‘Rodgers group.’ It would have been far better, for example, for him to have used an empty ginger jar for decoration” (*The House Beautiful* 1898:61-62). This comment augured the tone of many early-20th-century critics of mass-produced commodities; in this instance, *The House Beautiful’s* editors insinuated that the Chinese vessel was more “artistic” because the Chinese craft producer was not divorced from the object in the way mass-produced goods were detached from living craftspeople. The Brady household at 812 Castro Street may well have taken *The House Beautiful’s* advice. Terrence and Annie Brady had a four-room house that included a formal parlor; the “Japanese cabinet,” 23 “pictures” (probably chromolithographs), and 18 vases in Annie’s 1917 probate suggest the household still contained prototypical parlor furnishings long after parlors had become passé. The family’s circa 1889-1902 assemblage did not include any figurines, but it did include a Chinese ginger jar like that recommended by *The House Beautiful*. For most consumers, “the Orient” was a popular concept that evoked splendor, art, wisdom, despotism, and sensuality—concepts whose meaning was based more upon their tacit contrast to rational Western society than genuine understanding of the Far East (Said 1978). When Americans purchased Asian material goods they were consuming an idea about the contrast of East and West that was suitable for display in a genteel parlor where rational people could make sense of the Orient. Like all bric-a-brac, Asian material culture typically ends up saying vastly more about its consumers than the subjects it abstractly caricatures.
CONCLUSION

In the 1880s Jacob Riis trekked through New York City documenting Gotham’s “other half,” the impoverished masses of immigrants, people of color, and various other Americans forcefully excluded from affluence. Riis’ subsequent account, How the Other Half Lives, had a spectacular impact on the once-untroubled Gilded Age elite who consciously tolerated—if not condoned—profound poverty and marginalization in many places like New York. Yet, like many Victorians, even the morally indignant Riis was unable to subdue his own cultural xenophobia and racism and appreciate the complex aspirations that lurked beneath the surface of poverty. For instance, Riis seemed perplexed over why the “typical” African American

looks at the sunny side of life and enjoys it. . . . His home surroundings, except when he is utterly depraved, reflect his blithesome temper. The poorest negro's room in New York is bright with gaily-colored prints of his beloved “Abe Linkum,” General Grant, President Garfield, Mrs. Cleveland, and other national celebrities, and cheery with flowers and singing birds. In the art of putting his best foot foremost, of disguising his poverty by making a little go a long way, our negro has no equal. When a fair share of prosperity is his, he knows how to make life and home very pleasant to those about him. Pianos and parlor furniture abound in the uptown homes of colored tenants and give them a very prosperous air. But even where the wolf howls at the door, he makes a bold and gorgeous front. The amount of “style” displayed on fine Sundays on Sixth and Seventh Avenues by colored holiday-makers would turn a pessimist black with wrath [1890:118].

Riis reduced African American materialism to a contrived “front,” implying that even genteel objects like chromolithographs and parlor furniture failed to conceal the essential realities of poverty and racial identity. The well-heeled Riis knew many of New York’s most prominent Progressive citizens, so he was certainly well aware of the symbolism of Victorian material goods, but he was unable to fathom what such objects meant outside utterly genteel spaces. Riis expressed a paternalistic amusement at African American materialism and social ambition, even though he conceded that the African American was “loyal to the backbone, proud of being an American and of his new-found citizenship” (1890:118). Like many of his social reformer contemporaries, Riis was convinced that essential racial and class “traits” were substantial if not unyielding, and he determined that only transformations in objective housing conditions would create a disciplined working class. Riis was unable to comprehend that Victorian goods were genuinely significant to this “other half,” much less that they could mean many things to various citizens. Nevertheless, such goods were often one of the mechanisms marginalized consumers used to secure some small but significant foothold into consumer abundance.

Like many subsequent commentators, Riis apparently could not fathom how consumers might project personally significant symbolism onto apparently inconsequential things. He seemed unable to even wonder why marginalized consumers would seek out goods that were intended for vastly more lavish and ceremonial contexts than those in which they were eventually consumed. Thinkers like Thorstein Veblen who did directly confront these questions were prone to reduce it to “ emulation” of the powerful by the powerless. Yet what bric-a-brac suggests is that emulation is more complex than the instrumental copying of elite behavior with the assumption that such parroting will secure elite privilege. It is unlikely that many consumers were sufficiently naive to believe that their consumption of ceramic figurines or Victorian table settings would transform them into robber barons. Victorian consumption instead makes a
very powerful statement about the profound conviction many Americans have had in affluence, even when they were marginalized by that very society because of classism, patriarchy, racism, xenophobia, regional prejudices, and a host of other ideologies that always ensured that opportunity was not readily available to all Americans. Marxians have often reduced this apparent paradox to commodity fetishism, concluding that consumption is simply the masses’ way of unwittingly participating in their own oppression. There is indeed a genuine measure of oppression that is reproduced by consumption and its reproduction of wage labor. Yet it might just as well be argued that when consumers transform the meaning of mass-produced goods they are using those goods as vehicles of social critique as much as self-inflicted oppression.

The reality, of course, lies somewhere in between. For instance, just as the Linden Street redware Lincoln figure proclaims its Irish-American consumers’ ambitions to citizenship, it also reproduces an anti-black historical vision and risks ignoring the prejudices inflicted on Irish arrivals. These contradictions were already in public space, but objects like this figurine served to evoke the complexities of topics like riches, racism, and American identity that were difficult to otherwise articulate. For those scholars who hope objects will provide a clear reflection of 19th-century society’s most pressing social dilemmas, bric-a-brac instead provides a fragmentary, selective, and distorted reflection: rather than deliver a resounding symbolic resolution of profound social quandaries, bric-a-brac in most cases evoked generally inchoate and pleasant associations. Like most popular culture, bric-a-brac was a self-possessed reflection of American society that attempted to present back to consumers their deeply held preconceptions of themselves and others. While these West Oakland objects clearly could be understood to mean a wide range of things, they could not mean “anything”: for instance, there was an ambiguous but still restricted scope of symbolism that might convincingly be attached to Abraham Lincoln around 1880. The challenge is to identify what specific ambitions various consumers were most likely to connect to such symbols.

Bric-a-brac was, on one hand, an imaginative vehicle of personal and social ambition; yet, on the other hand, none of these desires were simply hatched from consumers’ imaginations, disconnected from dominant social structure. Bric-a-brac’s material forms were not provided by producers who were intent upon fomenting revolution through the sale of household curios. Instead, householders selected goods that symbolically “situated” the consumer within the world by appearing to secure the opportunities of consumer culture without threatening the social and ideological foundations upon which it stood. Because there was such a reasonably wide range of experiences of such ambition and ideology, it is not surprising that the meanings of household material culture would be so rich and complex.
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December 1994: First phase of fieldwork completed.

1995-1997: Oral history program. 18 interviews conducted with former West Oakland residents. 7 earlier interviews held by the Oakland History Room transcribed. 30 interviews on occupation lore conducted with African American porters, barbers, hairdressers, railroad workers, musicians, dancers, and others who formerly lived in West Oakland. All interviews are on file at the Oakland History Room.

April 1995: Second phase of fieldwork begins following delay as Caltrans contractors remove earth ramp overlying project blocks west of Market Street.

14 June 1995: Project Media day. Present on site were Channels 2, 4, 5, and 7, Associated Press, East Bay Express, and several other local papers.

11 October 1995: KRON Channel 4 affiliate, Bay TV, hosts its two hour morning news show live from Project Block 22.

3 May 1996: End of Fieldwork. Project completed without any delays to construction schedule. Letter report and site record forms submitted to Caltrans documenting field effort on each block.

1996-1999: Holding the Fort Exhibit (a tribute to the African American labor movement in West Oakland) tours over a dozen venues in the West before becoming a permanent exhibit at the African American Museum and Library at Oakland (AAMLO). ASC and Caltrans personnel and associates make presentations at most openings.


Spring 1998: Block 9 excavated.

June 1998: All laboratory work and photography completed. Interpretive Report outlined.


June 30, 1999: Contract expires for time with funding remaining and work must stop.

July 20, 1999: Public screening of Privy to the Past at Caltrans District 4 office in Oakland.

November 2, 1999: Receive fully executed amendment and begin work again.
May 2000: Request amendment for time only to extend reports through December 31, 2001. This was needed to make up for the five months lost in 1999 and for the resulting loss of momentum. Caltrans agrees to process amendment for time.

December 31, 2000: Contract expires with funding remaining. As no amendment for time has been received, work stops on the project. At this time, all of the BTRs are completed and awaiting Caltrans authorization to print.

September 1, 2001: Receive Task Order to finish reports (no additional funding).

December 2001: Twenty-five copies Cypress seven-volume BTRs printed and distributed to libraries.

April 2002: Four hundred copies of Cypress BTRs distributed on CDs to interested parties. Still available via Caltrans webpage.


April 1, 2003: All work suspended on project by Caltrans with funding remaining.

November 2003: Draft chapters of Interpretive Report posted to ASC webpage.

January 5, 2004: Receive new Task Order to complete Interpretive Report.

March 31, 2004: Submit draft report.

May 18, 2004: Receive 40 pages of comments from Caltrans.

June 30, 2004: Submit 100 copies of the final report.
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Anthropological Studies Center and The African American Museum and Library at Oakland
1996  Holding the Fort. Exhibit produced for FHWA and Caltrans District 4.

Collins, Willie
1997b  Barber Poles and Mugs: Black Barbering and Barbers in West Oakland. Exhibit at the Oakland History Room, Oakland Public Library.

De Cunzo, Lu Ann, and Mary Praetzellis

Ferneau, Jennifer
1999  “Perspectives from West Oakland: 19th Century Fisheries of the San Francisco Bay.” Society for Historical Archaeology (SHA) Annual Meeting, Salt Lake City.

Groth, Paul

Groth, Paul, and Marta Gutman

Gust, Sherri, and Michael Stoyka III

Gutman, Marta
Gutman, Marta (continued)


Hattersley-Drayton, Karana

1996 “Greeks in West Oakland.” Presentation to the Ascension History Committee of the Greek Orthodox Church, Oakland.


Hellmann, Virginia


Him, Madeline

1999a “1,000,000 Seeds—What are They Good For? What to do with Them?” SHA Annual Meeting, Salt Lake City.

1999b *1,000,000 Seeds, What are They Good For: An Analysis of the Seed Remains from the Cypress Freeway Replacement Project*. M.A. Thesis, Cultural Resource Management, Sonoma State University.

Huddleston, Julia


Levinson, Bill, Grace Ziesing, Adrian Praetzellis, and Janet Pape

1999 *Privy to the Past*. Video produced for Caltrans District 4.

McCartney, Scott


McIlroy, Jack


Meyer, Michael


Mullins, Paul


Pape, Janet

2000a  “Archaeology – Reaching into Dimensions of Art, Music, and Popular Writing.” SHA Annual Meeting, Quebec City.

2000b  “Privy to the Past: Historical Archaeology in West Oakland, California.” SHA Annual Meeting, Quebec City.

2001  “Hidden Stories from West Oakland.” SHA Annual Meeting, Long Beach.


Pape, Janet, and William Spires

Pape, Janet, with Greg White

Praetzelis, Adrian
1995  “Neat Stuff and Good Stories: Interpreting Historical Archaeology in Two Local Communities.” Public Benefits of Archaeology Conference, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

1996  “Interpreting Historical Archaeology in Two Local Communities.” Plenary Session. SCA Annual Meetings, Bakersfield.


1997  “Interpreting Historical Archaeology in Two Local Communities.” SHA Annual Meeting, Corpus Christi, Texas.

1998a  “Say ‘When’: The Concept of Legal Significance in Historical Archaeology.” Transportation Research Board Committee Meeting and Workshop on Historic and Archaeological Preservation, San Diego, California.

Praetzellis, Adrian (continued)


Praetzellis, Adrian, and Mary Praetzellis

2000 “Mangling Symbols of Gentility in the Wild West.” SHA Annual Meeting, Quebec City, Quebec.

2001a “Space, Time, and Community in West Oakland.” Plenary address. SCA Annual Meeting, Modesto, California.


2003 “Everything You Always Wanted to Know about Urban Archaeology but Were Afraid to Ask.” Transportation Research Board, Vancouver, Washington.

Praetzellis, Mary (ed.)


Praetzellis, Mary


Praetzellis, Mary, and Adrian Praetzellis

2001 “Black is Beautiful”: From Porters to Panthers, Archaeologies of West Oakland. SHA Annual Meeting, Long Beach, California.

Praetzellis, Mary, Adrian Praetzellis, and Aicha Woods

Psota, Sunshine, and Grace Ziesing

Spires, William

Solari, Elaine-Maryse

Stewart, Suzanne

Stewart, Suzanne, and Mary Praetzellis (eds.)

Thomson, Ron, and Marilyn Harper

Walker, Mark

Yang, Jeannie
1999a “Vanishing Sons: The Chinese Laundrymen at 1813 Seventh Street, Oakland, California.” SHA Annual Meeting, Salt Lake City.
1999b Vanishing Sons: The Chinese Laundry Workers at 1813 Seventh Street, West Oakland, California. MA thesis, Cultural Resource Management, Sonoma State University
Ziesing, Grace, and Janet Pape

Ziesing, Grace, Adrian Praetzelis, and Mary Praetzelis
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![Map of the area with feature associations by block.

---

**NUMBERED STREETS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FIFTH STREET</strong></th>
<th><strong>SIXTH STREET</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>654 Fifth</td>
<td>663 Sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>658 Fifth</td>
<td>667 Sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>662 Fifth</td>
<td>669 Sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>666 Fifth</td>
<td>671 Sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668 Fifth</td>
<td>679 Sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712 Fifth</td>
<td>711 Sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718 Fifth</td>
<td>713 Sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>762 Fifth</td>
<td>715/717 Sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>766 Fifth</td>
<td>721 Sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>768 Fifth</td>
<td>719 Sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770 Fifth</td>
<td>765 Sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772 Fifth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>914 Fifth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SEVENTH STREET</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1801/1805 Seventh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802 Seventh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813 Seventh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868/1874 Seventh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880 Seventh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Named Streets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Atlantic Street</strong></th>
<th><strong>Magnolia Street</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1776 Atlantic</td>
<td>820 Magnolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768 Atlantic</td>
<td>Block 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820 Atlantic</td>
<td>Block 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brush Street</strong></td>
<td><strong>Market Street</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802 Brush</td>
<td>812 Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806 Brush</td>
<td>817 Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812 Brush</td>
<td>819 Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Castro Street</strong></td>
<td><strong>Myrtle Street</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>809 Castro</td>
<td>810/812 Myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812 Castro</td>
<td>814/816 Myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>817 Myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>818 Myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>822 Myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>824 Myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>828 Myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>831 Myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cedar Street</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pine Street</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>881 Cedar</td>
<td>812 Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>883 Cedar</td>
<td>Block 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>889 Cedar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Filbert Street</strong></td>
<td><strong>Short Street</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810 Filbert</td>
<td>1825 Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812 Filbert</td>
<td>1856 Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813 Filbert</td>
<td>1860 Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>815 Filbert</td>
<td>Block 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817 Filbert</td>
<td>Block 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goss Street</strong></td>
<td><strong>William Street</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812/1814 Goss</td>
<td>1708 William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817 Goss</td>
<td>1712 William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862 Goss</td>
<td>1726 William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865 Goss</td>
<td>1814 William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871 Goss</td>
<td>1821 William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1823/1825 William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1827 William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linden Street</strong></td>
<td><strong>Wood Street</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816/818 Linden</td>
<td>793 Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>822 Linden</td>
<td>Block 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>824 Linden</td>
<td>Block 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830 Linden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BLOCK 1

1889

1902

1912

CASTRO STREET

SIXTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET

GROVE STREET

FIFTH STREET
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>654 Fifth</td>
<td>Privy 900</td>
<td>ca. 1885</td>
<td>Mann family</td>
<td>U.S., New Hampshire</td>
<td>capitalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>658 Fifth</td>
<td>Pit 928/929</td>
<td>ca. 1908</td>
<td>Centini family</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>shoemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>662 Fifth</td>
<td>Privy 933/1112</td>
<td>early 1880s</td>
<td>Tilghman/Holland</td>
<td>American African</td>
<td>widow/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>666 Fifth</td>
<td>Privy 947</td>
<td>ca. 1880</td>
<td>Donavan family</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>porter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668 Fifth</td>
<td>Well 953</td>
<td>ca. 1889-1896</td>
<td>Carter household</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>sewer contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812 Castro</td>
<td>Well 968</td>
<td>ca. 1889-1902</td>
<td>Brady family</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>plumber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>663 Sixth</td>
<td>Privy 985</td>
<td>ca. 1880</td>
<td>Bredhoff household</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>brewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>667 Sixth</td>
<td>Privy 951</td>
<td>ca. 1878</td>
<td>Paddock/Swain</td>
<td>U.S., Massachusetts</td>
<td>painter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>669 Sixth</td>
<td>Privy 954</td>
<td>ca. 1880</td>
<td>French family</td>
<td>U.S., Indiana</td>
<td>railroad conductor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>671 Sixth</td>
<td>Privy 955</td>
<td>ca. 1880</td>
<td>Irving family</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679 Sixth</td>
<td>Privy 993</td>
<td>ca. 1880</td>
<td>Judell store and residence</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>809 Castro</td>
<td>Privy 1431</td>
<td>early 1880s</td>
<td>Van Epps family</td>
<td>U.S., New York</td>
<td>carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712 Fifth</td>
<td>Privy 1409</td>
<td>mid 1880s</td>
<td>Barnett/Jacobs household</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>fruit peddlers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718 Fifth</td>
<td>Pit 1354</td>
<td>ca. 1900</td>
<td>Weber family</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>butcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privy 1376</td>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>Newell tenants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802 Brush</td>
<td>Well 1300</td>
<td>ca. 1876-1880</td>
<td>Breen family</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>laborer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privy 1301</td>
<td>mid 1890s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806 Brush</td>
<td>Pit 1317</td>
<td>ca. 1900</td>
<td>Kinsella household</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>landlady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812 Brush</td>
<td>Pit 1311</td>
<td>mid 1880s</td>
<td>Holland family</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>laborer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privy 1321</td>
<td>mid 70s-80s</td>
<td>Holland family</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>laborer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pit 1469</td>
<td>ca. 1900</td>
<td>Tierney household</td>
<td>Irish, African-American</td>
<td>landlady, Buffalo soldiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pit 1309</td>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>Holland tenants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721 Sixth</td>
<td>Privy 1330</td>
<td>late 1870s</td>
<td>Fleck family</td>
<td></td>
<td>hairdresser/midwife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719 Sixth</td>
<td>Privy 1358/1372</td>
<td>early 1880s</td>
<td>Cox tenants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pit 1368</td>
<td>late 1890s</td>
<td>Cox tenants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715/717</td>
<td>Pit 1387</td>
<td>early 1880s</td>
<td>Cox tenants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713 Sixth</td>
<td>Privy 1452, Pit 1461/1404</td>
<td>ca. 1880s</td>
<td>Stewart/Gibson household</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>hairdressers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711 Sixth</td>
<td>Privy 1420</td>
<td>ca. 1880s</td>
<td>Fallon/Heeney household</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>none?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privy 1454</td>
<td>ca. 1890</td>
<td>Fallon</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>widow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>765 Sixth</td>
<td>Privy 1785</td>
<td>ca. 1874</td>
<td>Curtis family</td>
<td>U.S., Massachusetts</td>
<td>capitalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>762 Fifth</td>
<td>Privy 1858</td>
<td>ca. 1882</td>
<td>Tighe family</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>railroad car cleaner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>766 Fifth</td>
<td>Pit 1759</td>
<td>ca. 1881</td>
<td>Lerche family</td>
<td>German, Prussian</td>
<td>musician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>768 Fifth</td>
<td>Pit 1753</td>
<td>ca. 1884</td>
<td>Taylor family</td>
<td>U.S., Indiana</td>
<td>carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pit 1815</td>
<td>late 1870s</td>
<td>Taylor family</td>
<td>U.S., Indiana</td>
<td>carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770 Fifth</td>
<td>Privy 1747</td>
<td>ca. 1880</td>
<td>Patrick Hickey</td>
<td>U.S., New York</td>
<td>carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772 Fifth</td>
<td>Well 1700</td>
<td>1870-1910</td>
<td>tenants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812 Market</td>
<td>Well 1703, Pit 1704/1705/1706</td>
<td>ca. 1906</td>
<td>Bankhead family</td>
<td>U.S., California</td>
<td>well-borer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BLOCK 4

1889

1902

1912
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>810/812 Myrtle</td>
<td>Privy 3119/3106</td>
<td>ca. 1880</td>
<td>tenants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>814/816 Myrtle</td>
<td>Privy 3139</td>
<td>early 1880s</td>
<td>Bush family</td>
<td></td>
<td>music teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>818 Myrtle</td>
<td>Privy 3178</td>
<td>early 1880s</td>
<td>Joseph McDonald family</td>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>822 Myrtle</td>
<td>Privy 3185</td>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>Murray family</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>laborer/gardener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>824 Myrtle</td>
<td>Pit 3196</td>
<td>ca. 1880</td>
<td>Scott household</td>
<td>U.S., New York</td>
<td>bookkeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>828 Myrtle</td>
<td>Privy 3300/3301</td>
<td>ca. 1890s</td>
<td>Chapman</td>
<td>U.S., Indiana</td>
<td>paperhanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>819 Market</td>
<td>Privy 3346</td>
<td>ca. 1890</td>
<td>Morgan/Mullen household</td>
<td>U.S., Indiana</td>
<td>druggist/county supervisor, clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817 Market</td>
<td>Pit 3382</td>
<td>ca. 1875</td>
<td>Lufkin family</td>
<td>U.S., Massachusetts</td>
<td>lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>914 Fifth</td>
<td>Pit 3137</td>
<td>ca. 1880</td>
<td>Miss Jane Dutton</td>
<td>U.S., Massachusetts</td>
<td>real estate investor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
 BLOCK 5

1889

MYRTLE STREET

SEVENTH STREET

FILBERT STREET

1902

MYRTLE STREET

SEVENTH STREET

FILBERT STREET

1912

MYRTLE STREET

SEVENTH STREET

FILBERT STREET
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>810 Filbert</td>
<td>Privy 3800</td>
<td>ca. 1880</td>
<td>Farmer household</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>widow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812 Filbert</td>
<td>Privy 3830</td>
<td>ca. 1875-1880</td>
<td>Quinn family</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>laborer/fireman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>831 Myrtle</td>
<td>Privy 3828</td>
<td>early 1880s</td>
<td>Tate family</td>
<td>U.S., Virginia</td>
<td>retired farmer, druggist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817 Myrtle</td>
<td>Privy 3802</td>
<td>Early 1880s</td>
<td>William McDonald family Scottish</td>
<td></td>
<td>bridge builder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BLOCK 6

1889

1902

1912
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>813 Filbert</td>
<td>Privy 4220</td>
<td>ca. 1880</td>
<td>Broderick family</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>laborer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>815 Filbert</td>
<td>Burial 4301</td>
<td>ca. 1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817 Filbert</td>
<td>Privy 4239</td>
<td>early 1880s</td>
<td>Corbett tenants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privy 4243</td>
<td>ca. 1877</td>
<td>Corbett tenants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830 Linden</td>
<td>Privy 4281</td>
<td>early 1880s</td>
<td>Coleman tenants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>824 Linden</td>
<td>Privy 4245</td>
<td>ca. 1880</td>
<td>Corrigan family</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>boiler maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>822 Linden</td>
<td>Privy 4236/4237</td>
<td>early 1890s</td>
<td>Vogt family</td>
<td>U.S., New York</td>
<td>carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816/818 Linden</td>
<td>Privy 4234</td>
<td>ca. 1887</td>
<td>Barry family and tenants</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>railroad conductor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BLOCK 9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>820 Magnolia</td>
<td>Privy 10102</td>
<td>ca. 1890</td>
<td>Frank family</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>brewery agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793 Wood</td>
<td>Privy</td>
<td>mid 1890s</td>
<td>Holderer family</td>
<td>U.S., New York</td>
<td>sewing machine salesman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821 William</td>
<td>Privy 6260</td>
<td>early 1880s</td>
<td>Leonhart household</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823/25 William</td>
<td>Privy 6292</td>
<td>mid-1880s</td>
<td>Finley family</td>
<td>U.S., Pennsylvania</td>
<td>shoemaker, dressmakers, laborer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privy 6239</td>
<td>early 1880s</td>
<td>Hansen and Hale</td>
<td>German and English</td>
<td>fisherman and railroad worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827 William</td>
<td>Privy 6300</td>
<td>early 1880s</td>
<td>Graffelman tenants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814 William</td>
<td>Privy 6325</td>
<td>mid-1880s</td>
<td>Robertson family</td>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>foreman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820 Atlantic</td>
<td>Privy 6282</td>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>Haynes family</td>
<td>U.S., Michigan</td>
<td>ship’s carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privy 6270</td>
<td>early 1870s</td>
<td>Scoville tenants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768 Atlantic</td>
<td>Well 7500</td>
<td>ca. 1905</td>
<td>Weisheimer family</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>painter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776 Atlantic</td>
<td>Well 7511</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td>Southern Pacific household</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>porters, laborer, laundresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Irish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812 Pine</td>
<td>Well 7175</td>
<td>ca. 1900</td>
<td>Schrock tenants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813 Seventh</td>
<td>Pit 5293</td>
<td>ca. 1875</td>
<td>Murphy’s butcher shop</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>butcher shop owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trench 5237</td>
<td>ca. 1908</td>
<td>Chinese laundry</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>laundry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801-1805 Seventh</td>
<td>Pit 5200</td>
<td>ca. 1900</td>
<td>Bushen Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Feature Associations by Block  C.25

BLOCK 24

1889

GOSS STREET

CEDAR STREET

W. SEVENTH STREET

1902

GOSS STREET

CEDAR STREET

W. SEVENTH STREET

1912

GOSS STREET

CEDAR STREET

W. SEVENTH STREET
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1817 Goss</td>
<td>Well 300</td>
<td>ca. 1893</td>
<td>Bridget O’Brien family</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>carpenter, lawyer, plumber, widow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pit 574</td>
<td>ca. 1909</td>
<td>Edward O’Brien family</td>
<td>U.S., California</td>
<td>plumber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802 Seventh</td>
<td>Well 559, Trench 579</td>
<td>ca. 1900-1915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pullman Hotel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Feature Associations by Block  C.27

BLOCK 27

1889

1902

1912
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1862 Goss</td>
<td>Pit 2855</td>
<td>ca. 1900</td>
<td>Fischer family</td>
<td>U.S., Louisiana</td>
<td>carpet layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>881 Cedar</td>
<td>Pit 2870/2880/2800</td>
<td>ca. 1900</td>
<td>Michael O’Brien family</td>
<td>U.S., California</td>
<td>engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privy 2822</td>
<td>ca. 1880</td>
<td>McLaughlin household</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>laborer, butcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pit 2812/2809</td>
<td>ca. 1880s</td>
<td>McLaughlin household</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>laborer, butcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>883 Cedar</td>
<td>Pit 2873/2874/2864/2786</td>
<td>ca. 1880</td>
<td>Lewis family</td>
<td>U.S., New York</td>
<td>railroad brakeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privy 2784, Pit 2877</td>
<td>ca. 1880</td>
<td>McLaughlin tenants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>889 Cedar</td>
<td>Privy 2719</td>
<td>ca. 1890s</td>
<td>Hudson family</td>
<td>U.S., Maryland</td>
<td>tower gate man</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table: Historical Archaeologies of West Oakland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1825 Short</td>
<td>Pit 2404</td>
<td>ca. 1900</td>
<td>Robert Crocker family</td>
<td>U.S., California</td>
<td>railroad laborer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812/1814 Goss Well 2007</td>
<td>ca. 1900</td>
<td>Lawrence and Ward families</td>
<td>English and U.S., Wyoming</td>
<td>railroad fireman and railroad brakeman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868-74 Seventh</td>
<td>Privy 4714</td>
<td>early 1870s</td>
<td>Gohsen family</td>
<td>Prussian</td>
<td>merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privy 4371/5167/5169</td>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>Kane tenants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880 Seventh</td>
<td>Well 4600, phase I</td>
<td>1870s-1880s</td>
<td>Railroad Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well 4600, phase 2</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td>Railroad Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865 Goss</td>
<td>Privy 4724, Pit 5112</td>
<td>late 1870s</td>
<td>McNamara family</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>laborer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871 Goss</td>
<td>Privy 4648</td>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>McNamara tenants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1870
BLOCK 31

1889

1902

1912
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1856 Short</td>
<td>Pit 2504</td>
<td>late 1890s</td>
<td>Caroline Crocker family</td>
<td>U.S., California</td>
<td>widow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860 Short</td>
<td>Pit 2524</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td>tenants</td>
<td>probably Portuguese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BLOCK 37

1889

SEVENTH STREET

WOOD STREET

WILLIAM STREET

1902

SEVENTH STREET

WOOD STREET

WILLIAM STREET

FIFTH STREET
(formerly WILLIAM STREET)

1912

SEVENTH STREET

WOOD STREET

WILLIAM STREET

FIFTH STREET
(formerly WILLIAM STREET)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1708 William</td>
<td>Privy 100</td>
<td>ca. 1880</td>
<td>Stryker/ Huddleson household</td>
<td>U.S., New York</td>
<td>coffee-mill worker machinist/dressmaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712 William</td>
<td>Pit 141</td>
<td>ca. 1878</td>
<td>O’Connell family</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>widow, hairdresser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726 William</td>
<td>Privy 156</td>
<td>ca. 1882</td>
<td>Long household</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>butcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

FEATURE SNAPSHOTS
**FEATURE SNAPSHOTs**

**KEY**

**Association:** Most likely historical association for feature determined by matching deposition date and documentary research. See Block Technical Report (BTR) for details. Families contain related individuals; households include non-family members.

**Occupation/Status:** Occupations derived from census and city directories. Status derived from occupation.

- Professional. Business owner, banker, real estate developer, capitalist, clerk, merchant, druggist, bridge builder, foreman.
- Skilled. Porter, contractor, conductor, peddler, music teacher, fireman, carpenter, machinist, fisherman, painter, hairdresser, butcher.
- Unskilled. Laborer, cleaner.

**Household type/number:** Derived from census and city directories, tied to deposition date.

- Nuclear family. One or two generations.
- Extended family. Three generations.

**House type/Square foot:** Derived from Sanborn Map.

- Informal Workers’ Cottage. Small, open lot dwelling with minimal side yards, one story or one story with basement. Usually wood-frame construction; two or three-room core (sometimes four); informal circulation, unspecialized rooms, and a back-porch toilet are common; additions often double or triple size of initial building. Frequently occupied by owners or leased from neighbor-owners with high densities of people per room (extended families, boarders and roomers are common); across-town owners possible, but not common.

- Almost-polite House. Small open lot dwelling with small side yards, one story or one story with basement. Usually wood-frame construction; permanently specialized space, hierarchical organization of rooms (five to six minimum), specialized circulation. Minimally, but clearly, reflects spatial and social orders of much larger middle-income homes with entry foyer, separate front rooms for entertaining (parlor, sitting room, and/or dining room), separate bedrooms for adults and children, screened from public view. Kitchen is made for the purpose, may be largest room of house; toilets inside dwelling or on back porch. Owner-occupiers, neighbor-owners, or across-town owners; high densities of people per room possible due to extended families, boarders or roomers. Built at one time, with attention paid to architectural style and decoration, additions are minor with respect to whole building.

- Polite Victorian House. Large open-lot dwelling (often two+ stories) with ample yards. Usually wood-frame construction, permanently specialized space, hierarchical organization of rooms (six or more), specialized circulation. Entry foyer,
corridors, and stairs (two, possible), formal front rooms for polite entertaining, with separate dining room and parlor being most important; sleeping rooms screened from public view (upstairs) with separate bedrooms for parents, boys, and girls. Kitchen is made for the purpose; toilets can be inside dwelling; accommodation usually provided for servants. Usually owners occupy, with low densities of people per room (although extended families are common and boarders possible). Built at one time, with great attention paid to architectural style and decoration.

Date: Deposition date based upon artifacts. See BTR for details.

House owner: Derived from census, Block Books, assessor’s maps, other documents. Relationship of house owner noted when available. Neighbor-owners live within a few blocks.

Pets: Derived from archaeological record.

Pests: Derived from archaeological record.

Bric-a-brac: Derived from archaeological record.

Meat by Weight: Derived from recalibrated faunal analysis. Worksheets will be posted at a future date.

Mammal Meat by Price: Derived from recalibrated faunal analysis. Worksheets will be posted at a future date. Includes only Beef, Mutton, and Pork.

Artifacts by Group: See BTR for details.

Food Preparation/Consumption by Vessel Function: See BTR for details.

Food Preparation/Consumption by Ceramic Fabric: See BTR for details.

Food Preparation/Consumption by Ceramic Decoration: See BTR for details.
Association: Mann family
Occupation(s)/status: miner, capitalist (banker)/professional
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: New England
Household type/number (max.): extended family/7 individuals
House type/sq. ft.: Almost-polite House/1,920 sq. ft.

Date: ca. 1885
House owner: Benjamin F. Mann (bachelor)
Pets: 1 cat, 1 dog
Pests: 4 rodents
Bric-a-brac: 8 items

Meat by Weight
- Beef 14.6%
- Mutton 13.4%
- Pork 27.1%
- Bird 40.5%
- Rabbit 0.6%
- Fish 3.8%

Mammal Meat by Price
- Low 34%
- Moderate 36.8%
- High 29.3%

Artifacts by Group
- Personal 26.6%
- Domestic 30.3%
- Activities 2.1%
- Indefinite 40.8%

Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function
- Serving 16.0%
- Tableware 25.0%
- Kitchen 1.0%
- Cups/Mugs 4.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 53.0%
- Indefinite 1.0%

Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric
- Porcelain 72.0%
- Chinese Porc. 4.0%
- W.I.E. 21.0%
- Yellowware 2.0%
- Earthenware 2.0%

Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration
- Decorated 42.1%
- Undec. 57.9%

See Key, page D-1
Block 1: 654 Fifth Street, Oakland  

Association: Mann family  
Occupation(s)/status: miner, capitalist (banker)/professional  
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: New England  
Household type/number (max.): extended family/7 individuals  
House type/sq. ft.: Almost-polite House/1,920 sq. ft.

Date: ca. 1885  
House owner: Benjamin F. Mann (bachelor)  
Pets: 1 cat, 1 dog  
Pests: 4 rodents  
Bric-a-brac: 8 items

See Key, page D-1
Association: Carter household  
Occupation(s)/status: porter/skilled  
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Virginia/African American  
Household type/number (max.): nuclear family probably with boarders/unknown  
House type/sq. ft.: Informal workers' cottage/760 sq. ft.  
Date: ca. 1890s  
House owner: Maximillian Jockner (neighbor-owner)  
Pets: 2 cats, 1 dog, 1 bird  
Pests: 2 rats  
Bric-a-brac: 12 items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meat by Weight</th>
<th>Mammal Meat by Price</th>
<th>Artifacts by Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beef 52.2%</td>
<td>Low 25.9%</td>
<td>Personal 32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutton 27.2%</td>
<td>Moderate 41.1%</td>
<td>Domestic 42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pork 15.0%</td>
<td>High 33.0%</td>
<td>Activities 2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird 5.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indefinite 22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbit 0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function</th>
<th>Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric</th>
<th>Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serving 15.0%</td>
<td>Porcelain 17.0%</td>
<td>Decorated 32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tableware 52.0%</td>
<td>Opaque-por. 13.0%</td>
<td>Undec. 67.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen 3.0%</td>
<td>W.I.E. 63.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cups/Mugs 19.0%</td>
<td>Yellowware 4.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stem/Tumblers 9.0%</td>
<td>Earthenware 2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indefinite 2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Key, page D-1
Association: Bredhoff household
Occupation(s)/status: Brewer, bookkeeper, saloon-keeper/professional
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Germany
Household type/number (max.): nuclear family with boarders/7 individuals
House type/sq. ft.: Polite Victorian house/1,740 sq. ft.
Date: ca. 1880
House owner: Charles Bredhoff (husband), also owned interest in a brewery
Pets: 1 rodent
Bric-a-brac: 1 item

Meat by Weight
- Beef 42.0%
- Mutton 8.6%
- Pork 2.4%
- Bird 46.9%

Mammal Meat by Price
- Low 22.0%
- Moderate 19.8%
- High 58.2%

Artifacts by Group
- Personal 22.8%
- Domestic 62.2%
- Activities 2.4%
- Indefinite 12.6%

Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function
- Serving 32.0%
- Tableware 21.0%
- Kitchen 3.0%
- Cups/Mugs 12.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 29.0%
- Indefinite 3.0%

Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric
- Porcelain 5.0%
- Opaque-porc. 5.0%
- W.I.E. 86.0%
- Yellowware 5.0%

Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration
- Decorated 42.9%
- Undec. 57.1%

See Key, page D-1
Block 1: 669 Sixth Street, Oakland

Feature: Privy 954

Association: French family
Occupation(s)/status: conductor/skilled
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Indiana, Kentucky
Household type/number (max.): nuclear family/7 individuals
House type/sq. ft.: Almost-polate house/870 sq. ft.
Date: ca. 1880
House owner: William K. Irving (neighbor-owner)
Pets: 3 cats, 10 dogs (mainly puppies), 1 bird
Pests: 9+ rats
Bric-a-brac: 2 items

See Key, page D-1
Block 1: 671 Sixth Street, Oakland

**Feature:** Privy 955

**Association:** Irving Family

**Occupation(s)/status:** clerk/professional

**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** Scotland, Ireland

**Household type/number (max.):** nuclear family/5 individuals

**House type/sq. ft.:** Informal workers' cottage/840 sq ft

**Date:** ca. 1880

**House owner:** William K. Irving (husband)

**Pets:** 2 cats, 1 dog, 1 bird

**Pests:** 2 rodents

**Bric-a-brac:** 4 items

---

**Meat by Weight**

- Beef 50.0%
- Mutton 16.8%
- Lamb 2.7%
- Pork 22.7%
- Bird 4.0%
- Fish 3.8%

**Mammal Meat by Price**

- Low 31.5%
- Moderate 46.8%
- High 21.7%

**Artifacts by Group**

- Personal 44.2%
- Domestic 28.5%
- Activities 6.4%
- Indefinite 20.9%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**

- Serving 11.0%
- Tableware 55.0%
- Kitchen 2.0%
- Cups/Mugs 22.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 9.0%
- Indefinite 6.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**

- Porcelain 16.0%
- Opaque-porc. 16.0%
- W.I.E. 61.0%
- Stoneware 2.0%
- Yellowware 2.0%
- Earthenware 2.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**

- Decorated 40.0%
- Undec. 59.9%

*See Key, page D-1*
**Association:** Brady Family

**Occupation(s)/status:** plumber/professional

**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** Ireland, England

**Household type/number (max.):** nuclear family/2 individuals

**House type/sq. ft.:** Almost-polite house/870 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. 1890s

**House owner:** Terence Brady (husband)

**Pets:**

**Pests:**

**Bric-a-brac:** 1 item

---

**Meat by Weight**
- Beef 66.9%
- Mutton 11.5%
- Pork 18.7%
- Bird 2.8%

**Mammal Meat by Price**
- Low 25.8%
- Moderate 60%
- High 14.2%

**Artifacts by Group**
- Personal 24.8%
- Domestic 40.5%
- Activities 5.1%
- Indefinite 29.6%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**
- Serving 22.0%
- Tableware 47.0%
- Kitchen 2.0%
- Cups/Mugs 16.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 9.0%
- Indefinite 5.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**
- Porcelain 24.0%
- Opaque-porc. 2.0%
- Chinese Porc. 2.0%
- W.I.E. 64.0%
- Earthenware 8.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**
- Decorated 42.0%
- Undec. 58.0%

See Key, page D-1
Association: Barnett and Jacobs households
Occupation(s)/status: Fruit peddlers/skilled
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Germany
Household type/number (max.): unknown
House type/sq. ft.: Informal workers' cottage/625 sq. ft.

Date: ca. 1880s
House owner: Miles Foley (landlord)
Pets: cats (1 adult, 2 kittens)
Pests: 4 rodents
Bric-a-brac: 1 item

See Key, page D-1
Block 2: 718 Fifth Street, Oakland

**Feature: Privy 1376**

**Association:** Julia Newell renters

**Occupation(s)/status:** unknown

**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** unknown

**Household type/number (max.):** unknown

**House type/sq. ft.:** Almost-polite-house/1,576 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. 1880s

**House owner:** Julia Newell (neighbor-owner)

**Pets:** 3 cats (1 adult, 2 kittens)

**Pests:**

**Bric-a-brac:** 2 items

---

**Meat by Weight**
- Beef 31.5%
- Mutton 46.0%
- Pork 10.0%
- Bird 11.3%
- Rabbit 1.4%

**Mammal Meat by Price**
- Low 19.0%
- Moderate 28.3%
- High 52.7%

**Artifacts by Group**
- Personal 27.0%
- Domestic 55.0%
- Activities 1.4%
- Indefinite 16.6%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**
- Serving 22.0%
- Tableware 43.0%
- Cups/Mugs 17.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 16.0%
- Indefinite 2.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**
- Porcelain 35.0%
- Chinese Porc. 2.0%
- Opaque-porc. 7.0%
- W.I.E. 50.0%
- Earthenware 7.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**
- Decorated 28.3%
- Undec. 71.7%

See Key, page D-1
Block 2: 718 Fifth Street, Oakland

**Feature:** Pit 1354

**Association:** Weber family

**Occupation(s)/status:** butcher/skilled

**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** Germany

**Household type/number (max.):** nuclear family/9 individuals

**House type/sq. ft.:** Almost-polite house/1,576 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. 1900

**House owner:** Julia Newell (neighbor-owner)

**Pets:**

**Pests:**

**Bric-a-brac:** 2 items

---

**Meat by Weight**

- No Data

**Mammal Meat by Price**

- No Data

**Artifacts by Group**

- Personal 36.1%
- Domestic 40.3%
- Activities 10.1%
- Indefinite 13.4%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**

- Serving 17.0%
- Tableware 50.0%
- Kitchen 4.0%
- Cups/Mugs 21.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 4.0%
- Indefinite 4.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**

- Porcelain 15.0%
- Opaque-por. 10.0%
- W.I.E. 65.0%
- Earthenware 10.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**

- Decorated 30.0%
- Undec. 70.0%

*See Key, page D-1*
Block 2: 711 Sixth Street, Oakland

**Feature: Privy 1454**

**Association:** Annie Fallon household

**Occupation(s)/status:** unknown

**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** probably Ireland

**Household type/number (max.):** unknown

**House type/sq. ft.:** Informal workers' cottage/630 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. 1890s

**House owner:** Annie Fallon (wife)

**Pets:** 1 dog

**Pests:***

**Bric-a-brac:** 3 items

---

**Meat by Weight**
- Beef 36.1%
- Mutton 48.5%
- Pork 9.5%
- Bird 5.4%
- Rabbit 0.5%

**Mammal Meat by Price**
- Low 29.4%
- Moderate 27.5%
- High 43.2%

**Artifacts by Group**
- Personal 28.6%
- Domestic 51.4%
- Indefinite 20.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**
- Serving 8.0%
- Tableware 69.0%
- Cups/Mugs 8.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 15.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**
- Porcelain 36.0%
- Chinese Porc. 9.0%
- Opaque-porc. 18.0%
- W.I.E. 27.0%
- Earthenware 9.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**
- Decorated 54.5%
- Undec. 45.4%

*See Key, page D-1*
Block 2: 713 Sixth Street, Oakland

**Feature:** Privy 1452/Pit 1461/Pit 1404

**Association:** Stewart household

**Occupation(s)/status:** barber, hairdresser, porter/professional

**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** Maryland/African American

**Household type/number (max.):** extended family/7 individuals

**House type/sq. ft.:** Polite Victorian house/1,700 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. 1880s

**House owner:** Emily Stewart (wife)

**Pets:** 1 rat

**Pests:**

**Bric-a-brac:**

---

**Meat by Weight**

- Beef 45.9%
- Mutton 34.3%
- Pork 14.0%
- Bird 4.6%
- Rabbit 1.2%

**Mammal Meat by Price**

- Low 40.0%
- Moderate 29.6%
- High 30.4%

**Artifacts by Group**

- Personal 29.0%
- Domestic 29.0%
- Activities 4.8%
- Indefinite 37.1%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**

- Tableware 38.0%
- Cups/Mugs 13.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 38.0%
- Indefinite 13.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**

- Porcelain 40.0%
- W.I.E. 60.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**

- Decorated 20.0%
- Undec. 80.0%

See Key, page D-1
Block 2: 719 Sixth Street, Oakland

Feature: Privy 1358/Privy 1372

Association: Catherine Cox renters
Occupation(s)/status: unknown
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: unknown
Household type/number (max.): unknown
House type/sq. ft.: Informal workers' cottage/760 sq. ft.

Date: ca. early 1880s
House owner: Catherine Cox (landlady)
Pets: 1 cat
Pests: 1 mouse
Bric-a-brac: 5 items

Meat by Weight
- Beef 51.4%
- Mutton 33.6%
- Pork 7.6%
- Bird 6.9%
- Rabbit, squirrel 0.5%

Mammal Meat by Price
- Low 25.5%
- Moderate 43.4%
- High 31.1%

Artifacts by Group
- Personal 37.1%
- Domestic 42.6%
- Activities 4.2%
- Indefinite 16.0%

Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function
- Serving 14.0%
- Tableware 44.0%
- Kitchen 2.0%
- Cups/Mugs 14.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 26.0%

Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric
- Porcelain 25.0%
- Opaque-porc. 5.0%
- W.I.E. 68.0%
- Yellowware 1.0%
- Earthenware 1.0%

Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration
- Decorated 44.2%
- Undec. 55.8%

See Key, page D-1
Block 2: 802 Brush Street, Oakland

**Association:** Breen family

**Occupation(s)/status:** laborer/unskilled

**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** Ireland

**Household type/number (max.):** nuclear family/3 individuals

**House type/sq. ft.:** Almost-polite house/800 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. late 1870s

**House owner:** James Holland (neighbor-owner)

**Pets:**

**Pests:**

**Bric-a-brac:**

---

**Meat by Weight**

- Beef 59.5%
- Mutton 26.8%
- Pork 5.3%
- Bird 8.5%

**Mammal Meat by Price**

- Low 9.1%
- Moderate 27.2%
- High 63.7%

**Artifacts by Group**

- Personal 44.8%
- Domestic 25.0%
- Activities 9.4%
- Indefinite 20.8%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**

- Serving 31.0%
- Tableware 50.0%
- Cups/Mugs 6.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 6.0%
- Indefinite 6.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**

- Porcelain 21.0%
- W.I.E. 64.0%
- Earthenware 14.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**

- Decorated 50.0%
- Undec. 50.0%

See Key, page D-1
Block 2: 802 Brush Street, Oakland

Association: James Holland renters
Occupation(s)/status: unknown
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: unknown
Household type/number (max.): unknown
House type/sq. ft.: Almost-polite house/800 sq. ft.

Date: ca. mid 1890s
House owner: James Holland (neighbor-owner)
Pets: 
Pests: 
Bric-a-brac: 1 items

See Key, page D-1
Association: Mary Kinsella household
Occupation(s)/status: landlady/working class
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Irish
Household type/number (max.): two sisters with boarder/3 individuals
House type/sq. ft.: Informal workers' cottage/695 sq. ft.

Date: ca. 1900
House owner: Mary Kinsella
Pets:
Pests:
Bric-a-brac:

See Key, page D-1
Association: James Holland renters  
Occupation(s)/status: unknown  
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: unknown  
Household type/number (max.): unknown  
House type/sq. ft.: Informal workers' cottage/720 sq. ft.  

Date: ca. 1880s  
House owner: James Holland (neighbor-owner)  
Pets:  
Pests:  
Bric-a-brac: 2 items

See Key, page D-1
Block 3: 762 Fifth Street, Oakland

**Feature:** Privy 1858

- **Association:** Tighe Family
- **Occupation(s)/status:** railroad car cleaner/unskilled
- **Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** Ireland
- **Household type/number (max.):** nuclear family/3 individuals
- **House type/sq. ft.:** Almost-polite house/1,590 sq. ft.

- **Date:** ca. 1880s
- **House owner:** neighbor-owner
- **Pets:**
- **Pests:**
- **Bric-a-brac:**

---

**Meat by Weight**

No Data

**Mammal Meat by Price**

No Data

**Artifacts by Group**

- Personal 37.9%
- Domestic 32.7%
- Activities 5.2%
- Indefinite 24.1%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**

- Serving 67.0%
- Cups/Mugs 17.0%
- Indefinite 17.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**

- Porcelain 17.0%
- Opaque-porc. 17.0%
- W.I.E. 50.0%
- Earthenware 17.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**

- Decorated 33.3%
- Undec. 66.6%

*See Key, page D-1*
Association: Lerche family
Occupation(s)/status: musician/skilled
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Prussia
Household type/number (max.): nuclear family/8 individuals
House type/sq. ft.: Informal workers' cottage/460 sq. ft.

Date: ca. early 1880s
House owner: Marshall Curtis (neighbor-owner)
Pets: No Data
Pests: No Data
Bric-a-brac: 1 item

Meat by Weight
Mammal Meat by Price
Artifacts by Group

Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function
- Serving 26.0%
- Tableware 11.0%
- Kitchen 11.0%
- Cups/Mugs 37.0%
- Indefinite 16.0%

Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric
- Porcelain 5.0%
- Opaque-porc. 11.0%
- W.I.E. 68.0%
- Yellowware 16.0%
- Decorated 21.0%
- Undec. 79.0%

See Key, page D-1
Block 3: 770 Fifth Street, Oakland

**Association:** Hickey and Loomis families

**Occupation(s)/status:** carpenter, carpet layer/skilled

**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** New York

**Household type/number (max.):** nuclear family/3 individuals

**House type/sq. ft.:** Informal workers' cottage/460 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. 1880

**House owner:** Marshall Curtis (neighbor-owner)

**Pets:**

**Pests:**

**Bric-a-brac:** 1 item

---

**Meat by Weight**

- Beef 50.9%
- Mutton 42.2%
- Pork 1.2%
- Bird 4.6%
- Rabbit 1.2%

**Mammal Meat by Price**

- Low 26.2%
- Moderate 59.4%
- High 14.3%

**Artifacts by Group**

- Personal 42.8%
- Domestic 42.1%
- Activities 4.4%
- Indefinite 10.7%

---

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**

- Serving 26.0%
- Tableware 11.0%
- Kitchen 11.0%
- Cups/Mugs 37.0%
- Indefinite 16.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**

- Porcelain 5.0%
- Opaque-porc. 11.0%
- W.I.E. 68.0%
- Yellowware 16.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**

- Decorated 56.4%
- Undec. 43.6%

---

*See Key, page D-1*
Block 3: 765 Sixth Street, Oakland

Feature: Privy 1785

Association: Curtis family
Occupation(s)/status: real-estate agent/professional
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Massachusetts
Household type/number (max.): nuclear family with boarder (?)/3 individuals
House type/sq. ft.: Polite Victorian house/1,850 sq. ft.

Date: ca. 1874
House owner: Marshall Curtis (husband)
Pets: 1 cat
Pests:
Bric-a-brac: 1 item

Meat by Weight
- Beef 42.8%
- Mutton 48.8%
- Pork 1.9
- Bird 6.4%

Mammal Meat by Price
- Low 23.3%
- Moderate 28.5%
- High 48.3%

Artifacts by Group
- Personal 15.0%
- Domestic 40.0%
- Activities 3.3%
- Indefinite 41.7%

Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function
- Serving 18.0%
- Tableware 64.0%
- Cups/Mugs 9.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 9.0%

Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric
- Porcelain 22.0%
- W.I.E. 78.0%

Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration
- Decorated 77.8%
- Undec. 22.2%

See Key, page D-1
Block 4: 817 Market Street, Oakland

**Association:** Lufkin household  
**Occupation(s)/status:** policeman and lawyer/professional; dressmaker  
**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** New England  
**Household type/number (max.):** nuclear family with boarder  
**House type/sq. ft.:** Informal workers' cottage w/additions/2,300 sq. ft.  
**Date:** ca. 1875  
**House owner:** J.S. Fogg (neighbor-owner)  
**Pets:**  
**Bric-a-brac:** 6 items

---

**Meat by Weight:** No Data  
**Mammal Meat by Price:** No Data  
**Artifacts by Group:**  
- Personal 24.9%  
- Domestic 24.6%  
- Activities 0.6%  
- Indefinite 50.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function:**  
- Serving 22.0%  
- Tableware 24.0%  
- Cups/Mugs 12.0%  
- Stem/Tumblers 42.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric:**  
- Porcelain 63.0%  
- W.I.E. 21.0%  
- Earthenware 8.0%  
- CC Ware 8.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration:**  
- Decorated 45.8%  
- Undec. 54.2%

See Key, page D-1
Block 4: 819 Market Street, Oakland

**Association:** Morgan-Mullen household  
**Occupation(s)/status:** druggist, County Supervisor; County Clerk/professional  
**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** Indiana  
**Household type/number (max.):** extended family/4 individuals  
**House type/sq. ft.:** Polite Victorian house/1,500 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. 1890  
**House owner:** Bartlett Morgan (husband)  
**Pets:** 1 bird, 1 cat  
**Pests:** 1 rat  
**Bric-a-brac:** 2 items

---

**Meat by Weight**
- Beef 46.9%
- Mutton 33.8%
- Pork 10.8%
- Bird 8.5%

**Mammal Meat by Price**
- Low 19.1%
- Moderate 39.3%
- High 41.6%

**Artifacts by Group**
- Personal 29.2%
- Domestic 30.3%
- Activities 13.3%
- Indefinite 27.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**
- Serving 21.0%
- Tableware 32.0%
- Kitchen 4.0%
- Cups/Mugs 4.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 39.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**
- Porcelain 27.0%
- Opaque-porc. 7.0%
- W.I.E. 53.0%
- Yellowware 7.0%
- Stoneware 7.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**
- Decorated 26.7%
- Undec. 73.3%

See Key, page D-1
Block 4: 810/812 Myrtle Street, Oakland  
Feature: Privy 3119/3106

**Association:** Bushell and Wood renters  
**Occupation(s)/status:** unknown  
**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** unknown  
**Household type/number (max.):** unknown  
**House type/sq. ft.:** adjoining Almost-polite houses/900 sq. ft. each

**Date:** ca. 1880  
**House owner:** Bushell and Wood (landlords)  
**Pets:** 2 birds  
**Pests:** 1 rat  
**Bric-a-brac:** 1 item

### Meat by Weight
- Beef 32.7%  
- Mutton 43.3%  
- Pork 11.7%  
- Bird 11.1%  
- Rabbit 1.2%

### Mammal Meat by Price
- Low 18.3%  
- Moderate 28.5%  
- High 53.2%

### Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function
- Serving 13.0%  
- Tableware 60.0%  
- Kitchen 2.0%  
- Cups/Mugs 2.0%  
- Stem/Tumblers 16.0%  
- Indefinite 7.0%

### Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric
- Porcelain 47.0%  
- W.I.E. 47.0%  
- Yellowware 3.0%  
- Earthenware 3.0%

### Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration
- Decorated 18.7%  
- Undec. 81.2%

**See Key, page D-1**
Association: Bush family  
Occupation(s)/status: widowed, music teacher/skilled  
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: unknown  
Household type/number (max.): nuclear family/3 individuals  
House type/sq. ft.: Almost-polite house/900 sq. ft.

Date: ca. early 1880s  
House owner: Harriet Cook (landlady)  
Pets: 1 dog  
Pests:  
Bric-a-brac: 

See Key, page D-1
Block 4: 818 Myrtle Street, Oakland

**Association:** Joseph McDonald household

**Occupation(s)/status:** carpenter/skilled

**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** Canada/Ireland

**Household type/number (max.):** nuclear family with servant/6 individuals

**House type/sq. ft.:** Polite Victorian house/1,630 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. early 1880s

**House owner:** Joseph McDonald (husband)

**Pets:** 1 bird

**Pests:** 1 rat

**Bric-a-brac:** 2 items

**Meat by Weight**
- Beef 30.7%
- Mutton 27.1%
- Pork 5.3%
- Bird 36.8%

**Mammal Meat by Price**
- Low 27.3%
- Moderate 37.3%
- High 35.4%

**Artifacts by Group**
- Personal 30.8%
- Domestic 42.8%
- Activities 5.7%
- Indefinite 20.8%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**
- Serving 22.0%
- Tableware 51.0%
- Cups/Mugs 11.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 13.0%
- Indefinite 6.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**
- Porcelain 36.0%
- Opaque-porc. 3.0%
- W.I.E. 58.0%
- Earthenware 3.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**
- Decorated 27.8%
- Undec. 72.2%

See Key, page D-1
Association: Murray household  
Occupation(s)/status: gardener/unskilled  
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Ireland  
Household type/number (max.): extended family/3 individuals, probably one boarding  
House type/sq. ft.: Informal workers' cottage/825 sq. ft.  
Date: ca. 1880s  
House owner: Mary Murray (wife)  
Pets: 1 cat  
Pests: 3 rodents  
Bric-a-brac: 2 items

### Meat by Weight
- Beef 52.9%
- Mutton 35.8%
- Pork 3.8%
- Bird 7.5%

### Mammal Meat by Price
- Low 25.6%
- Moderate 40.3%
- High 34.0%

### Artifacts by Group
- Personal 33.5%
- Domestic 50.7%
- Activities 3.2%
- Indefinite 12.7%

### Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function
- Serving 15.0%
- Tableware 59.0%
- Cups/Mugs 15.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 7.0%
- Indefinite 3.0%

### Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric
- Porcelain 34.0%
- W.I.E. 57.0%
- Yellowware 2.0%
- Earthenware 6.0%
- CC Ware 2.0%

### Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration
- Decorated 35.8%
- Undec. 64.1%

See Key, page D-1
Block 4: 828 Myrtle Street, Oakland

Feature: Privy 3300/Pit 3301

Association: Chapman household
Occupation(s)/status: paper-hanger/skilled
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Indiana
Household type/number (max.): unknown
House type/sq. ft.: Polite Victorian house/1,300 sq. ft.

Date: ca. 1890s
House owner: Mrs. J.A. Stewart (landlady)
Pets: 1 cat, 1 kitten
Pests: 7 rats
Bric-a-brac: 6 items

Meat by Weight
- Beef 41.2%
- Mutton 32.7%
- Pork 10.9%
- Bird 15.2%

Mammal Meat by Price
- Low 19.1%
- Moderate 34.3%
- High 46.6%

Artifacts by Group
- Personal 32.4%
- Domestic 46.4%
- Activities 5.9%
- Indefinite 15.4%

Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function
- Serving 21.0%
- Tableware 38.0%
- Kitchen 2.0%
- Cups/Mugs 17.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 15.0%
- Indefinite 7.0%

Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric
- Porcelain 28.0%
- Asian Porc. 9.0%
- Opaque-porc. 4.0%
- W.I.E. 50.0%
- Stoneware 1.0%
- Earthenware 7.0%

Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration
- Decorated 48.6%
- Undec. 51.4%

* Consists of 1% Chinese porcelain, 7% Japanese porcelain, and 1% possible Japanese porcelain.

See Key, page D-1
Association: Quinn family
Occupation(s)/status: railroad fireman/skilled
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Ireland
Household type/number (max.): nuclear family/4 individuals
House type/sq. ft.: Informal workers' cottage/600 sq. ft.

Date: ca. late 1870s
House owner: John Quinn (husband)

Pets: 
Pests: 
Bric-a-brac: 

See Key, page D-1
Association: William McDonald household
Occupation(s)/status: bridge builder, bookkeeper/professional
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Scotland, Vermont
Household type/number (max.): nuclear family/4 individuals
House type/sq. ft.: Almost-polite house/1,000 sq. ft.

Date: ca. early 1880s
House owner: Catherine Rheid (landlady)
Pets: 1 bird
Pests: 
Bric-a-brac: 4 items

See Key, page D-1
Block 5: 831 Myrtle Street, Oakland

**Feature: Privy 3828**

**Association:** Tate family

**Occupation(s)/status:** retired farmer, druggist, dentist/professional

**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** Virginia/Kentucky

**Household type/number (max.):** extended family/6 individuals

**House type/sq. ft.:** Polite Victorian house/1,700 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. 1880s

**House owner:** Samuel P. Tate (husband)

**Pets:**

**Pests:**

**Bric-a-brac:** 2 items

---

**Meat by Weight**

- Beef 33.3%
- Mutton 32.7%
- Pork 21.1%
- Bird 11.6%
- Rabbit 1.4%

**Mammal Meat by Price**

- Low 16.0%
- Moderate 48.9%
- High 35.1%

**Artifacts by Group**

- Personal 21.3%
- Domestic 52.5%
- Activities 11.5%
- Indefinite 14.8%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**

- Serving 30.0%
- Tableware 35.0%
- Cups/Mugs 10.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 10.0%
- Indefinite 15.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**

- Porcelain 18.0%
- Chinese Porc. 6.0%
- Asian porc. 6.0%
- W.I.E. 59.0%
- Earthenware 12.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**

- Decorated 47.1%
- Undec. 52.9%

*See Key, page D-1*
Block 6: 817 Filbert Street, Oakland

**Feature:** Privy 4239

**Association:** Corbett renters

**Occupation(s)/status:** unknown

**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** unknown

**Household type/number (max.):** unknown

**House type/sq. ft.:** Informal workers' cottage/870 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. early 1880s

**House owner:** James and/or Sarah Corbett (neighbor-owner)

**Pets:** 1 cat

**Pests:** 1 rat

**Bric-a-brac:** 1 item

---

**Meat by Weight**
- Beef 49.5%
- Mutton 32.9%
- Pork 9.6%
- Bird 8.0%

**Mammal Meat by Price**
- Low 45.2%
- Moderate 47.3%
- High 7.5%

**Artifacts by Group**
- Personal 42.6%
- Domestic 40.3%
- Activities 4.0%
- Indefinite 13.1%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**
- Serving 5.0%
- Tableware 54.0%
- Cups/Mugs 23.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 5.0%
- Indefinite 13.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**
- Porcelain 18.0%
- Chinese Porc. 3.0%
- Opaque-porc. 3.0%
- W.I.E. 74.0%
- Earthenware 3.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**
- Decorated 23.5%
- Undec. 76.5%

See Key, page D-1
Association: Barry family and renters
Occupation(s)/status: railroad collector/skilled
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Ireland
Household type/number (max.): nuclear family with tenants above or below
House type/sq. ft.: Informal workers' cottage divided into 2-story flat/1,000 sq. ft. total
Date: ca. late 1880s
House owner: Patrick Barry (husband)
Pets: 1 cat
Pests: 1 rat
Bric-a-brac: 5 items

See Key, page D-1
Block 6: 822 Linden Street, Oakland  

**Association:** Vogt family  
**Occupation(s)/status:** railroad carpenter/skilled  
**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** New York, Germany  
**Household type/number (max.):** nuclear family/4 individuals  
**House type/sq. ft.:** 2-story Informal workers' cottage/930 sq. ft.  
**Date:** ca. early 1890s  
**House owner:** William Vogt (husband)  
**Pets:**  
**Pests:**  
**Bric-a-brac:** 4 items

---

**Meat by Weight**  
No Data  

**Mammal Meat by Price**  
No Data  

**Artifacts by Group**  
- Personal 36.1%  
- Domestic 27.6%  
- Activities 17.6%  
- Indefinite 18.8%  

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**  
- Serving 25.0%  
- Tableware 14.0%  
- Cups/Mugs 18.0%  
- Stem/Tumblers 36.0%  
- Indefinite 7.0%  

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**  
- Porcelain 23.0%  
- Opaque-porc. 8.0%  
- W.I.E. 62.0%  
- Earthenware 8.0%  

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**  
- Decorated 15.4%  
- Undec. 84.6%  

See Key, page D-1
Association: Corrigan family
Occupation(s)/status: machinist/boilermaker, plumber/skilled
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Ireland
Household type/number (max.): nuclear family/3 individuals
House type/sq. ft.: Informal workers' cottage/825 sq. ft.

Date: ca. 1880
House owner: Peter Corrigan (husband)

Pets: 1 rat
Bric-a-brac: 4 items
Block 6: 830 Linden Street, Oakland

Feature: Privy 4281

**Association:** Coleman renters

**Occupation(s)/status:** unknown

**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** unknown

**Household type/number (max.):** unknown

**House type/sq. ft.**: Informal workers' cottage/625 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. early 1880s

**House owner:** Martin Coleman (neighbor-owner)

**Pets:** 2 dogs, 3 cats, 1 small cat or dog

**Pests:** 1 rat

**Bric-a-brac:** 1 item

---

**Meat by Weight**
- Beef 29.6%
- Mutton 42.7%
- Pork 22.1%
- Bird 5.5%

**Mammal Meat by Price**
- Low 39.5%
- Moderate 34.5%
- High 26.0%

**Artifacts by Group**
- Personal 43.5%
- Domestic 33.3%
- Activities 3.6%
- Indefinite 19.6%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**
- Serving 12.0%
- Tableware 55.0%
- Kitchen 3.0%
- Cups/Mugs 18.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 9.0%
- Indefinite 3.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**
- Porcelain 14.0%
- Chinese Porc. 11.0%
- Asian Porc. 7.0%
- Opaque-porc. 11.0%
- W.I.E. 57.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**
- Decorated 32.1%
- Undec. 67.9%

See Key, page D-1
Association: Frank Family
Occupation(s)/status: barkeeper-brewery agent/skilled
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Germany
Household type/number (max.): nuclear family/2 individuals
House type/sq. ft.: Polite Victorian house/1,850 sq. ft.

Date: ca. 1890
House owner: Charles and Annie Frank
Pets:
Pests:
Bric-a-brac:

See Key, page D-1
Block 19: 793 Wood Street, Oakland

**Feature:** Privy 8445

**Date:** ca. mid 1890s

**House owner:** Antonia A. L. Heyer (Schrieber)
(neighbor-owner, probably a relative)

**Pets:** 1 cat

**Pests:**

**Bric-a-brac:**

**Association:** Holderer family

**Occupation(s)/status:** machinist
(sewing-machine salesman)/skilled

**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** New York, California

**Household type/number (max.):** nuclear family/4 individuals

**House type/sq. ft.:** Informal workers' cottage/574 sq. ft.

---

**Meat by Weight**

- Beef 36.5%
- Mutton 15.4%
- Pork 23.1%
- Bird 19.2%
- Fish 5.8%

**Mammal Meat by Price**

- Low 32.1%
- Moderate 43.3%
- High 24.6%

**Artifacts by Group**

- Personal 52.1%
- Domestic 26.1%
- Activities 1.7%
- Indefinite 20.2%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**

- Serving 12.0%
- Tableware 47.0%
- Cups/Mugs 6.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 24.0%
- Indefinite 12.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**

- W.I.E. 100%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**

- Decorated 45.4%
- Undec. 54.5%

See Key, page D-1
Block 20: 1814 Atlantic Street, Oakland

**Feature:** Privy 6325

**Association:** Robertson family

**Occupation(s)/status:** foreman CPRR bridge dept./professional

**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** Canada

**Household type/number (max.):** nuclear family/7 individuals

**House type/sq. ft.:** 2-story almost polite house/1,700 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. middle 1880s

**House owner:** Daniel Robertson (husband)

**Pets:**

**Pests:**

**Bric-a-brac:** 4 items

**Meat by Weight**
- Beef 73.4%
- Mutton 18.3%
- Pork 4.1%
- Bird 4.1%

**Mammal Meat by Price**
- Low 32.9%
- Moderate 48.0%
- High 19.1%

**Artifacts by Group**
- Personal 36.4%
- Domestic 28.7%
- Activities 6.2%
- Indefinite 28.7%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**
- Serving 16.0%
- Tableware 48.0%
- Cups/Mugs 18.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 6.0%
- Indefinite 12.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**
- Porcelain 12.0%
- Asian Porc. 2.0%
- Opaque-porc. 5.0%
- W.I.E. 74.0%
- Earthenware 7.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**
- Decorated 32.6%
- Undec. 67.4%

See Key, page D-1
Block 20: 1820 Atlantic Street, Oakland

**Feature:** Privy 6270

**Association:** Scoville renters

**Occupation(s)/status:** unknown

**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** unknown

**Household type/number (max.):** unknown

**House type/sq. ft.:** Informal workers' cottage with additions/1,000 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. early 1870s

**House owner:** Ives Scoville (neighbor-owner)

**Pets:** 1 cat

**Pests:**

**Bric-a-brac:**

---

**Meat by Weight**
- Beef 70.8%
- Mutton 18.3%
- Pork 8.2%
- Bird 2.7%

**Mammal Meat by Price**
- Low 23.2%
- Moderate 35.1%
- High 41.7%

**Artifacts by Group**
- Personal 25.8%
- Domestic 41.3%
- Activities 8.0%
- Indefinite 25.0%

---

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**
- Serving 15.0%
- Tableware 50.0%
- Kitchen 2.0%
- Cups/Mugs 22.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 9.0%
- Indefinite 2.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**
- Porcelain 17.0%
- Opaque-porc. 9.0%
- W.I.E. 62.0%
- Yellowware 7.0%
- Earthenware 2.0%
- CC Ware 2.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**
- Decorated 54.8%
- Undec. 45.2%

See Key, page D-1
Association: Leonhard household
Occupation(s)/status: cooper, carpenters/skilled
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Germany
Household type/number (max.): nuclear family with roomers
House type/sq. ft.: Informal workers' cottage/500 sq. ft.

Date: ca. early 1880s
House owner: Estate of Michael McNamara (neighbor-owner)
Pets: 1 cat
Pests: 2 rats
Bric-a-brac:

See Key, page D-1
Block 20: 1823/25 William Street, Oakland

**Association:** Hansen family and Hayles family

**Occupation(s)/status:** fisherman and railroad worker, fisherman/skilled

**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** Germany and England

**Household type/number (max.):** nuclear family/2 individuals and nuclear family/5 individuals

**House type/sq. ft.:** Informal workers' cottage divided into two units/748 sq. ft. total

**Date:** ca. early 1880s

**House owner:** Margaret Graffelman (neighbor-owner)

**Pets:** bird, 2 cats

**Pests:** 1 mouse

**Bric-a-brac:**

---

**Meat by Weight**
- Beef 76.0%
- Mutton 11.6%
- Pork 4.1%
- Bird 5.2%
- Rabbit 0.09%
- Fish 2.9%

**Mammal Meat by Price**
- Low 47.3%
- Moderate 41.0%
- High 11.7%

**Artifacts by Group**
- Personal 33.2%
- Domestic 45.4%
- Activities 5.1%
- Indefinite 16.0%
- Human 0.3%

---

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**
- Serving 10.0%
- Tableware 58.0%
- Kitchen 2.0%
- Cups/Mugs 12.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 10.0%
- Indefinite 10.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**
- Porcelain 7.0%
- Chinese Porc. 2.0%
- Opaque-porc. 5.0%
- W.I.E. 81.0%
- Yellowware 2.0%
- Earthenware 2.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**
- Decorated 16.3%
- Undec. 83.7%

See Key, page D-1
Association: Finley family and unknown family
Occupation(s)/status: shoemaker and dressmakers/skilled
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Pennsylvania
Household type/number (max.): nuclear family/5 individuals
House type/sq. ft.: Informal workers' cottage divided into two units/748 sq. ft. total

Date: ca. middle 1880s
House owner: Margaret Graffelman (neighbor-owner)
Pets: 1 cat
Pests:
Bric-a-brac: 1 items

See Key, page D-1
Block 20: 1827 William Street, Oakland

Feature: Privy 6300

**Association:** Graffelman renters  
**Occupation(s)/status:** unknown  
**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** unknown  
**Household type/number (max.):** unknown  
**House type/sq. ft.:** Informal workers' cottage/780 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. early 1880s  
**House owner:** Margaret Graffelman (neighbor-owner)  
**Pets:** 1 dog, 4 cats  
**Pests:** 2 mice, 3 rats  
**Bric-a-brac:** 1 item

---

**Meat by Weight**
- Beef: 45.6%
- Mutton: 24.2%
- Pork: 7.7%
- Bird: 8.8%
- Rabbit: 1.3%
- Fish: 12.4%

**Mammal Meat by Price**
- Low: 26.7%
- Moderate: 42.6%
- High: 30.6%

**Artifacts by Group**
- Personal: 41.1%
- Domestic: 29.8%
- Activities: 3.4%
- Indefinite: 25.7%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**
- Serving: 21.0%
- Tableware: 40.0%
- Cups/Mugs: 9.0%
- Stem/Tumblers: 30.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**
- Porcelain: 12.0%
- Opaque-porcelain: 4.0%
- W.I.E.: 84.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**
- Decorated: 44.0%
- Undec.: 56.0%

---

See Key, page D-1
Block 21: 1768 Atlantic Street, Oakland

**Feature: Well 7500**

**Association:** Weisheimer family  
**Occupation(s)/status:** housepainter/skilled  
**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** Germany, Illinois  
**Household type/number (max.):** nuclear family/2 individuals  
**House type/sq. ft.:** Informal workers' cottage/706 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. 1903  
**House owner:** John Weisheimer (husband)  
**Pets:**  
**Pests:**

**Bric-a-brac:**

See Key, page D-1
Association: Southern Pacific household
Occupation(s)/status: railroad workers including laborers and porters; laundresses/skilled
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Ireland and southern states/African American
Household type/number (max.): nuclear families and boarders/unknown
House type/sq. ft.: Almost-polite house/1,000 sq. ft.

Date: ca. 1890s

House owner: Maria Agnes Heaney (neighbor-owner)
Pets: bird, 2 cats
Pests: 2 rats
Bric-a-brac: 10 items
Block 21: 812 Pine Street, Oakland

Association: Schrock renters
Occupation(s)/status: unknown
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: unknown
Household type/number (max.): unknown
House type/sq. ft.: Informal workers’ cottage/484 sq. ft.

Date: ca. 1900
House owner: W. A. Schrock (landlord)
Pets: 1 dog
Pests:
Bric-a-brac: 4 items

See Key, page D-1
Block 22: 1813 Seventh Street, Oakland

Feature: Trench 5237

Association: Chinese Laundry
Occupation(s)/status: laundrymen/Chinese
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Chinese
Household type/number (max.): unknown, lived elsewhere
House type/sq. ft.:

Date: ca. 1908
House owner: Estate of Edward Murphy (neighbor-owner)
Pets: 1 dog
Pests:
Bric-a-brac:

See Key, page D-1
Block 24: 1802-08 Seventh Street, Oakland

**Feature:** Well 559

**Association:** Pullman Hotel

**Occupation(s)/status:** mixed, many in service sector for railroad (cook, waiter, porter, barber)

**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** mixed/White and African American

**Household type/number (max.):** lodging house/39

**House type/sq. ft.:** lodging house with bar and dining room/15,528 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. 1900-1915

**House owner:** John Levaggi (leased to various proprietors)

**Pets:** 1 cat

**Pests:** 5 rats

**Bric-a-brac:**

See Key, page D-1
**Block 24: 1817 Goss Street, Oakland**  

**Feature:** Well 300  

**Association:** Bridget O’Brien household  
**Occupation(s)/status:** lawyer/professional and plumbing contractor/skilled  
**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** (1st generation) and California (2nd generation)  
**Household type/number (max.):** extended family/5 individuals  
**House type/sq. ft.:** simple, two-story house/1,650 sq. ft.  
**Date:** ca. 1880s-1900  
**House owner:** Bridget O’Brien (widow)  
**Pets:** bird  
**Pests:** 2 rats  
**Bric-a-brac:**

---

**Meat by Weight**
- Beef 22.1%
- Mutton 48.0%
- Pork 6.5%
- Bird 23.4%

**Mammal Meat by Price**
- Low 13.1%
- Moderate 47.0%
- High 39.9%

**Artifacts by Group**
- Personal 35.9%
- Domestic 35.4%
- Activities 6.1%
- Indefinite 22.7%

---

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**
- Serving 15.0%
- Tableware 51.0%
- Kitchen 3.0%
- Cups/Mugs 18.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 8.0%
- Indefinite 5.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**
- Porcelain 15.0%
- Japanese Porc. 3.0%
- Opaque-por. 9.0%
- W.I.E. 68.0%
- Yellowware 6.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**
- Decorated 23.5%
- Undec. 76.5%

---

See Key, page D-1
Association: Michael McLaughlin household
Occupation(s)/status: laborer, dressmaker/unskilled and butcher/professional
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Ireland
Household type/number (max.): extended family with boarders/10 individuals
House type/sq. ft.: Informal workers' cottage, 1-1/2 story/1,120 sq. ft.

Date: ca. 1880
House owner: Michael McLaughlin (husband)
Pets:
Pests:
Bric-a-brac: 1 item

See Key, page D-1
**Block 27: 881 Cedar Street, Oakland**

**Association:** Michael O’Brien household  
**Occupation(s)/status:** plumber and railroad engineer/skilled; dressmaker  
**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** California  
**Household type/number (max.):** extended family with boarder/9 individuals  
**House type/sq. ft.:** Informal workers' cottage, 1-1/2 story/1,120 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. 1900  
**House owner:** Edward McLaughlin (brother-in-law)  
**Pets:** bird  
**Pests:**

**Bric-a-brac:** 9 items

---

**Meat by Weight**

- No Data

**Mammal Meat by Price**

- No Data

**Artifacts by Group**

- Personal 18.7%
- Domestic 66.6%
- Activities 0.8%
- Indefinite 13.9%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**

- Serving 14.0%
- Tableware 34.0%
- Kitchen 1.0%
- Cups/Mugs 23.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 27.0%
- Indefinite 1.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**

- Porcelain 33.0%
- Asian Porc. 7.0%*
- Opaque-porc. 7.0%
- W.I.E. 49.0%
- Earthenware 4.0%
- Common Pottery 1.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**

- Decorated 62.1%
- Undec. 37.9%

* Consists of 3% Chinese porcelain, 1% Japanese porcelain, and 3% unidentified Asian porcelain.

See Key, page D-1
Block 27: 883 Cedar Street, Oakland

Association: McLaughlin tenants
Occupation(s)/status: unknown
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: unknown
Household type/number (max.): unknown
House type/sq. ft.: Informal workers’ cottage/440 sq. ft.

Date: ca. 1870s
House owner: Michael McLaughlin (neighbor-owner)
Pets:
Pests:
Bric-a-brac:

Meat by Weight
- Beef 38.8%
- Mutton 43.2%
- Pork 8.1%
- Bird 10.0%

Mammal Meat by Price
- Low 20.4%
- Moderate 46.3
- High 33.4%

Artifacts by Group
- Personal 31.5%
- Domestic 55.1%
- Activities 1.7%
- Indefinite 11.8%

Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function
- Serving 19.1%
- Tableware 52.9%
- Cups/Mugs 17.6%
- Stem/Tumblers 8.8%
- Indefinite 1.5%

Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric
- Porcelain 3.7%
- Chinese Porc. 5.6%
- Opaque-porc. 1.9%
- W.I.E. 85.2%
- Earthenware 3.7%

Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration
- Decorated 42.6%
- Undec. 57.4%

See Key, page D-1
Block 27: 883 Cedar Street, Oakland

Feature: Privy 2786/Pit 2864/Pit 2873/Pit 2874

Association: Lewis household
Occupation(s)/status: railroad brakeman/skilled
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: New York
Household type/number (max.): extended family/6 individuals
House type/sq. ft.: Informal workers' cottage/440 sq. ft.

Date: ca. 1880
House owner: Michael McLaughlin (neighbor-owner)
Pets: 1 dog
Pests:
Bric-a-brac: 3 items

Meat by Weight
- Beef 35.0%
- Mutton 44.8%
- Pork 18.3%
- Bird 1.9%

Mammal Meat by Price
- Low 36.8%
- Moderate 48.1%
- High 15.2%

Artifacts by Group
- Personal 40.2%
- Domestic 29.4%
- Activities 9.4%
- Indefinite 20.6%

Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function
- Serving 9.0%
- Tableware 56.0%
- Cups/Mugs 13.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 16.0%
- Indefinite 6.0%

Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric
- Porcelain 9.0%
- Opaque-porc. 17.0%
- W.I.E. 65.0%
- Earthenware 9.0%

Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration
- Decorated 47.8%
- Undec. 52.2%

See Key, page D-1
Block 27: 889 Cedar Street, Oakland

**Feature:** Privy 2719

**Association:** Hudson household

**Occupation(s)/status:** railroad tower gateman/skilled

**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** Maryland

**Household type/number (max.):** extended family/3 individuals

**House type/sq. ft.:** Informal workers' cottage/680 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. 1890s

**House owner:** Northern Railroad Company (landlord)

**Pets:**

**Pests:**

**Bric-a-brac:** 1 item

---

**Meat by Weight**
- Beef 26.0%
- Mutton 13.0%
- Pork 30.4%
- Bird 30.4%

**Mammal Meat by Price**
- Low 55.8%
- Moderate 33.7%
- High 10.5%

**Artifacts by Group**
- Personal 25.7%
- Domestic 51.4%
- Indefinite 22.9%

---

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**
- Serving 10.0%
- Tableware 20.0%
- Cups/Mugs 40.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 30.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**
- W.I.E. 66.7%
- Earthenware 33.3%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**
- Decorated 33.3%
- Undec. 66.7%

See Key, page D-1
Association: Fischer family  
Occupation(s/status): carpet layer-upholsterer/skilled  
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Germany, California  
Household type/number (max.): nuclear family/10 individuals  
House type/sq. ft.: Informal workers' cottage/750 sq. ft.  
Date: ca. 1900  
House owner: Northern Railroad Company (landlord)  
Pets:  
Pests:  
Bric-a-brac:
Block 28: 1812/1814 Goss Street, Oakland

**Feature:** Well 2007

**Association:** Lawrence family and Ward family

**Occupation(s)/status:** railroad fireman/skilled and railroad brakeman/skilled

**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** England, California and Wyoming, California and nuclear family/4 individuals

**Household type/number (max.):** nuclear family/7 individuals and nuclear family/4 individuals

**House type/sq. ft.:** Polite Victorian house (2 identical Italianates) / 1,260 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. 1900

**House owner:** Charlotte Lawrence (wife) and Isaac Saxter (landlord)

**Pets:** 1 bird

**Pests:**

**Bric-a-brac:** 4 items

---

**Meat by Weight**
- Beef 67.2%
- Mutton 22.2%
- Pork 7.4%
- Bird 2.9%
- Rabbit 0.4%

**Mammal Meat by Price**
- Low 20.6%
- Moderate 45.3%
- High 34.1%

**Artifacts by Group**
- Personal 37.4%
- Domestic 40.9%
- Activities 4.5%
- Indefinite 17.3%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**
- Serving 21.0%
- Tableware 42.0%
- Kitchen 2.0%
- Cups/Mugs 15.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 14.0%
- Indefinite 7.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**
- Porcelain 23.0%
- Chinese Porc. 1.0%
- Asian Porc. 0.1%
- Opaque-porc. 8.0%
- W.I.E. 57.0%
- Yellowware 1.0%
- Earthenware 7.0%
- Com. Pottery 1.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**
- Decorated 45.9%
- Undec. 54.0%

*See Key, page D-1*
Block 28: 1825 Short Street, Oakland  

Feature: Pit 2404

Association: Robert Crocker family
Occupation(s)/status: railroad laborer/unskilled
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: California
Household type/number (max.): nuclear family/4 individuals
House type/sq. ft.: Informal workers' cottage/600 sq. ft.

Date: ca. 1900
House owner: Francis H. Page (landlord)
Pets: 
Pests: 
Bric-a-brac: 1 item

Meat by Weight
No Data

Mammal Meat by Price
No Data

Artifacts by Group

Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function

Serving 11.0%
Tableware 51.0%
Cups/Mugs 22.0%
Stem/Tumblers 14.0%
Indefinite 3.0%

Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric

Porcelain 4.0%
Opaque-porc. 46.0%
W.I.E. 50.0%

Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration

Decorated 7.1%
Undec. 92.9%

See Key, page D-1
Association: Gohsen family
Occupation(s)/status: painter and merchant/professional
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Prussia
Household type/number (max.): nuclear family/5 individuals
House type/sq. ft.: simple 2-story house/2,050 sq. ft.

Date: ca. early 1870s
House owner: Charles Gohsen (husband)
Pets: bird, 3 cats
Pests: 2 rats, 1 squirrel
Bric-a-brac: 2 items

See Key, page D-1
Block 29: 1874 Seventh Street, Oakland  
Feature: Privy Complex 4731/5167/5169

**Association:** Gohsen renters  
**Occupation(s)/status:** unknown  
**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** unknown  
**Household type/number (max.):** unknown  
**House type/sq. ft.:** Backyard Informal workers’ cottage/466 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. early 1880s  
**House owner:** Charles and Mary Gohsen (neighbor-owner)  
**Pets:** 1 cat  
**Pests:** 1 rat  
**Bric-a-brac:** 3 items

---

**Meat by Weight**
- Beef 55.1%
- Mutton 19.0%
- Pork 19.4%
- Rabbit 2.7%
- Bird 3.8%

**Mammal Meat by Price**
- Low 17.9%
- Moderate 43.5%
- High 38.5%

**Artifacts by Group**
- Personal 39.0%
- Domestic 44.4%
- Activities 4.5%
- Indefinite 12.1%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**
- Serving 19.0%
- Tableware 41.0%
- Kitchen 1.0%
- Cups/Mugs 15.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 24.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**
- Porcelain 7.0%
- Opaque-porc. 1.0%
- W.I.E. 87.0%
- Yellowware 1.0%
- Earthenware 1.0%
- Stoneware 1.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**
- Decorated 29.0%
- Undec. 71.0%

*See Key, page D-1*
Association: Railroad Exchange Hotel
Occupation(s)/status: mixed, mainly skilled railroad workers/skilled
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Bremen (owner), mixed boarders
Household type/number (max.): hotel
House type/sq. ft.: Hotel/3,700 sq. ft.

Date: ca. 1870s-1880s
House owner: John Frese (owner-operated)
Pets: 1 cat
Pests: 1 rat, 1 mole
Bric-a-brac: 2 items

See Key, page D-1
Association: Railroad Exchange Hotel
Occupation(s)/status: mixed, mainly skilled workers/skilled
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: mixed, mainly American and northern European
Household type/number (max.): hotel/30+ individuals
House type/sq. ft.: Hotel/7,020 sq. ft.

Date: ca. 1890s
House owner: Olaf and Johanna Anderson (owner-operated)
Pets: 1 cat
Pests:
Bric-a-brac: 1 item

See Key, page D-1
Block 29: 1865 Goss Street, Oakland

**Feature:** Privy 4724

**Association:** McNamara Family

**Occupation(s)/status:** railroad laborer/unskilled

**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** Ireland

**Household type/number (max.):** nuclear family/4 individuals

**House type/sq. ft.:** Informal worker's cottage/1,179 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. late 1870s

**House owner:** Michael McNamara (husband)

**Pets:**

**Pests:**

**Bric-a-brac:**

---

**Meat by Weight**
- Beef 52.0%
- Mutton 24.0%
- Pork 5.3%
- Bird 5.3%
- Fish 13.3%

**Mammal Meat by Price**
- Low 53.4%
- Moderate 32.4%
- High 14.2%

**Artifacts by Group**
- Personal 47.9%
- Domestic 26.8%
- Activities 1.0%
- Indefinite 24.2%

---

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**
- Serving 9.0%
- Tableware 52.0%
- Cups/Mugs 22.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 13.0%
- Indefinite 4.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**
- W.I.E. 95.0%
- Earthenware 5.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**
- Decorated 25.0%
- Undec. 75.0%

See Key, page D-1
Association: Caroline Crocker family
Occupation(s)/status: laborer/unskilled
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: California
Household type/number (max.): nuclear family/3 individuals
House type/sq. ft.: Informal workers' cottage/720 sq. ft.

Date: ca. 1890s
House owner: California Trading Company
Pets: 1 cat
Pests:
Bric-a-brac: 5 items

See Key, page D-1
Block 31: 1860 Short Street, Oakland

Feature: Pit 2524

Association: California Trading Company renters
Occupation(s)/status: unknown, probably railroad laborer/unskilled
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: probably Portugal
Household type/number (max.): unknown
House type/sq. ft.: Informal workers' cottage/550 sq. ft.

Date: ca. 1890s
House owner: California Trading Company (landlord)
Pets:
Pests:
Bric-a-brac:

Meat by Weight

Mammal Meat by Price

Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function

Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric

Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration

Artifacts by Group

No Data

See Key, page D-1
Block 37: 1708 William Street, Oakland

**Feature:** Privy 100

**Association:** Huddleston and Stryker households

**Occupation(s)/status:** coffee mill hand, machinist/skilled; dressmaker

**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** New York and California

**Household type/number (max.):** 2 nuclear families (one boarding)

**House type/sq. ft.:** Almost-polite house/1,140 sq. ft.

**Date:** ca. 1880

**House owner:** not known

**Pets:** 1 dog

**Pests:**

**Bric-a-brac:**

---

**Meat by Weight**

- Beef: 65.9%
- Mutton: 28.9%
- Pork: 0.8%
- Rabbit: 1.6%
- Fish: 2.8%

**Mammal Meat by Price**

- Low: 34.5%
- Moderate: 18.8%
- High: 46.7%

**Artifacts by Group**

- Personal: 27.9%
- Domestic: 43.4%
- Activities: 11.6%
- Indefinite: 17.1%

---

**Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function**

- Serving: 6.0%
- Tableware: 58.0%
- Cups/Mugs: 13.0%
- Stem/Tumblers: 13.0%
- Indefinite: 10.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric**

- Porcelain: 16.0%
- Opaque-porc.: 4.0%
- W.I.E.: 76.0%
- Yellowware: 4.0%

**Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration**

- Decorated: 20.0%
- Undec.: 80.0%

*See Key, page D-1*
Association: Huddleson/Stryker/King households
Occupation(s)/status: mill worker/skilled; mill machinist, dressmaker; ship joiner, carpenter/skilled
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: New York and California
Household type/number (max.): 2 nuclear families plus boarders
House type/sq. ft.: Almost-polite house/1,140 sq. ft.

Date: ca. 1881, possibly later
House owner: owner not known before 1883; Mrs. A. A. Dixon; G. T. Brown
Pets: 1 rat
Bric-a-brac:

Meat by Weight
- Beef 63.1%
- Mutton 24.1%
- Pork 12.8%

Mammal Meat by Price
- Low 31.8%
- Moderate 25.0%
- High 43.2%

Artifacts by Group
- Personal 40.0%
- Domestic 42.8%
- Activities 1.1%
- Indefinite 16.1%

Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function
- Serving 24.0%
- Tableware 40.0%
- Cups/Mugs 18.0%
- Stem/Tumblers 14.0%
- Indefinite 4.0%

Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric
- Porcelain 5.0%
- Asian Porc. 3.0%
- Opaque-porc. 8.0%
- W.I.E. 80.0%
- Earthenware 5.0%

Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration
- Decorated 25.0%
- Undec. 75.0%

See Key, page D-1
Block 37: 1712 William Street, Oakland

Association: O'Connell family
Occupation(s)/status: hairdresser/skilled
Place of origin(s)/ethnicity: Ireland
Household type/number (max.): nuclear family/5 individuals
House type/sq. ft.: Informal workers' cottage/484 sq. ft.

Date: ca. 1878
House owner: Margaret O'Connell (widow)
Pets: 1 rat
Bric-a-brac: 1 item

Meat by Weight
- Beef 41.6%
- Mutton 55.0%
- Pork 3.4%

Mammal Meat by Price
- Low 38.3%
- Moderate 30.3%
- High 31.3%

Artifacts by Group
- Personal 30.8%
- Domestic 37.2%
- Activities 10.3%
- Indefinite 21.8%

Serving 14.0%
Tableware 57.0%
Cups/Mugs 14.0%
Stem/Tumblers 14.0%

W.I.E. 100.0%
Decorated 16.7%
Undec. 83.3%

See Key, page D-1
Block 37: 1726 William Street, Oakland

Feature: Privy 156

**Association:** Long household  
**Occupation(s)/status:** butcher, saloon keeper/skilled  
**Place of origin(s)/ethnicity:** Germany  
**Household type/number (max.):** nuclear family with roomer/5 individuals  
**House type/sq. ft.:** not available

**Date:** ca. 1882  
**House owner:** Louis Hufschmidt (neighbor-owner)  
**Pets:** fish  
**Pests:** 2 rats  
**Bric-a-brac:** 2 items

### Meat by Weight
- Beef 49.2%  
- Mutton 25.9%  
- Pork 10.3%  
- Bird 13.3%  
- Rabbit 0.3%  
- Fish 1.0%

### Mammal Meat by Price
- Low 45.9%  
- Moderate 38.8%  
- High 15.3%

### Artifacts by Group
- Personal 24.9%  
- Domestic 59.3%  
- Activities 2.4%  
- Indefinite 13.4%

### Food Prep./Consumption by Vessel Function
- Serving 8.0%  
- Tableware 51.0%  
- Cups/Mugs 10.0%  
- Stem/Tumblers 28.0%  
- Indefinite 3.0%

### Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Fabric
- Porcelain 23.0%  
- W.I.E. 69.0%  
- Earthenware 7.0%

### Food Prep./Consumption by Ceramic Decoration
- Decorated 23.1%  
- Undec. 76.9%

See Key, page D-1
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DAY-TO-DAY ON THE CYPRESS PROJECT
EXCERPTS FROM THE SITE LOG
DAY-TO-DAY ON THE CYPRUS PROJECT

Jack Mc Ilroy

PREAMBLE

Oakland gets bad press, 114 murders in 2003, from a population of 360,000. A challenge for its residents and for those who run the city. On site, we had our share of local inner-urban afflictions, including car theft (both completed and attempted), site offices graffiti-tagged, archaeological features looted for valuable bottles, and offers of drugs and illicit services.

We also met some of the friendliest people you could come across. The crew grew particularly fond of Esther’s Orbit Room across Seventh Street from the sites, near the West Oakland Postal Center.

The research was a team effort. Boundary responsibilities were often blurred. Janet Pape, the Caltrans Archaeology Project Manager, kept the flag flying for the State agency, our client. Dr. Adrian Praetzellis, the ASC’s Director, visited weekly to confer with his Field Director and crew, as in “that one’s too tough for me—Adrian can sort it out.”

After years of planning, fieldwork took 78 weeks between April 1994 and May 1996. The archaeology was often hard, dirty physical labor in the hot, dusty days of summer and the freezing rain of winter. If you had looked out of a BART window as the train passed Market Street in winter 1994, you would have seen a group of dirty and bedraggled characters under the elevated freeway clustered around a fire in a 55-gallon drum as the rain poured down. Not the local homeless, these were the archaeologists.

Wet or dry, bedraggled or not, the crew did an outstanding job. I am particularly indebted to the Assistant Field Director Mike Meyer who, apart from his archaeological skills, covered for me during the many times I had to be off the site to deal with project issues. There is also something to be said for Mike’s size when dealing with construction contractors—somewhere between an NFL linebacker and a Maori rugby player. It grants a certain awe that, despite a grand title, does not necessarily accompany a 5 ft. 8 in., 125-pound Field Director.

Of similar stature to Mike was the designated Prehistoric Sites Monitor, Nina Ilic, who hails from Yugoslavia. Nina was sufficiently bulky to block out the sun for a photo shoot when needed. He monitored numerous deep trenches opened by heavy equipment for construction of freeway columns and placement of underground utilities, looking for soil changes that might indicate prehistoric use of the area. The sides of excavated historic-period features were also examined, and the bottoms of selected features augered to test for prehistoric site indicators. No evidence of prehistoric sites was found during our work, although a site was found later during related construction in the Postal Center.

Other eclectic members of the crew included Mike Stoyka, a Taekwon Do black belt who had worked archaeological projects on Superfund sites (highly contaminated and toxic) in the eastern United States. For music fans, one of our long-term crew was Keith “Monkey” Warren, lead singer for The Adicts, a punkish based European band (www.suburbias.com/adicts). On a similar note, although not musically, was Paula Frazer, who travelled diligently along during the day while scaling musical heights at night (www.paulafrazer.com).

In addition to the above, excavation involved an indefatigable core crew of 10 archaeologists: Anmarie Medin, Bill Stillman, Bryan Mischke, Rick Wolter, Dave Makar, Ginger Hellmann, Richelle Coffin, Pete Messick, Conrad Praetzel and Margo Schur. Additional crew were employed as needed with sometimes up to 20 archaeologists working to a tight schedule imposed by the freeway reconstruction. For the first 28 weeks, we were able to work well in advance of construction on selected blocks.
EXCERPTS FROM THE SITE LOG

8 April 1994
C.J. Vandegrift and her survey team plotted in the comers of the 1889 Sanborn lots on Blocks 36 and 37. She estimates her accuracy at plus or minus 6 inches, which should be good enough for us. Trenches were then marked out on the ground with Scotty Thompson’s help. Jim Quinn organized most of the equipment and we are ready to roll.

FIELDWORK WEEK 1, BLOCK 18
Mon. 18 April
On site with Adrian Praetzellis, a backhoe, a loader, and three Mountain Cascade personnel to begin with. Initial machine clearance shows isolated shallow sheet-refuse concentrations with 20th-century material. Later, picked up fence-line postholes and posts, and possible trash pits.

FIELDWORK WEEK 2, BLOCKS 18, 36, AND 37
Mon. 25 April
Block 18. Overnight rain had flooded it. The natural soil, a sandy silt, does not drain well. Aicha Woods discovered that 1726 Pacific was a brothel around 1912.

Block 37 was machine stripped with the backhoe all day. About 15 pits were initially visible. The surface under the gravel is beaten-up, compacted sandy soil from demolition of the houses and parking-lot construction. We are finding fence posts. There were frequent heavy rain showers today.

Wed. 27 April
Janet saw a couple of professional bottle collectors with probes and Sanborn maps working over Block 24. Mike Meyer and Todd Jaffke went over to explain the error of their ways. They said “everybody was doing it, including the firemen from the nearby fire station,” but agreed to leave.

Janet and Mike then went to the fire station but nobody answered the door. This block should be fenced fast.

FIELDWORK WEEK 3, BLOCKS 36 AND 37
Thurs. 5 May
Artifacts from half-sectioned pits were examined by Adrian Praetzellis to assess whether or not to continue with excavation.

FIELDWORK WEEK 4, BLOCKS 37 AND 36
Mon. 9 May
The rain over the weekend has spread sand and grit over a fair part of the site. Block 36 was flooded out.

On Block 37, in one privy there is some newspaper embedded in the lime. It would be interesting if it had a date, but considering what it was probably used for I really don’t want to look.

FIELDWORK WEEK 5, BLOCKS 36 AND 37
Mon. 16 May
Block 37. I’ve introduced the concept of Archaeological AIMS for the project. AIMS stands for: Association, Integrity, Materials, Stratigraphy. If a feature has got all of these, then it’s a winner. The idea is to try and focus the crew’s thoughts in these directions so they can assess the value of what they’re working on. The current major crew evaluation is that I’m not supplying them with enough doughnuts at break time.

Fri. 20 May
Janet contacted Dick McCombe at the Post Office, who allowed us access to the roof of the building so that we could get some good aerial overview photos of the site. The most useful pits in
terms of the research design are likely to be the three privies along the back fence line: Privy 156 at 1726 William; Privy 141 at 1712, although it was partly collapsed by heavy rain after it had been half-sectioned; and the most productive feature of all, Privy 100 at 1708.

**Fieldwork Week 6, Block 24**

Mon. 6 June

Dug two test trenches outside the northwest corner of the ASA to check the stratigraphy. First trench showed about 1.5 feet of churned-up soil, then our usual yellow sand. Second trench had more disturbance with about 4 feet of soil above sand. We had a local complain about the dust being stirred up. There was a lot, as it was windy today.

Tues. 7 June

The new Portacan finally arrived on site. Unfortunately, it was still padlocked and I was elsewhere with the key. My return was met with crew abuse.

Wed. 8 June

Pac Bell/PGE came to check their busted phone cable. They came last night but the guard wouldn’t let then on site and told them to come back during business hours. Apparently they jumped a part of the fence, which was only 3 feet high. We’ve fixed that fence and they probably deserved their reception.

We are finding a number of pits, dating to probably 1930s onwards, at the rear fence line between the trees, where the firemen tell us they found a well and a whole bunch of bottles that they have in their fire station.

Thurs. 9 June

We have removed about 12 to 18 inches of soil to expose the archaeological features. We started to clear the east end of the site, where the Pullman Hotel is shown on the 1889 Sanborn at 1802 Seventh Street. It was hot on site.

Fri. 10 June

Decided to clear the demolition debris from the rear of the Pullman Hotel at 1802 Seventh. Found a brick-lined well on the back fence line. Mary Praetzellis thought it might be a hotel cistern. Sunk a 3 feet wide hole with the machine to find water table between the walls at 1802 Seventh. It was located at about 14 to 15 feet below current unexcavated ground surface, or 12 feet below the surviving Pullman Hotel wall remnants. The rear wall of the presumed Pullman Hotel kitchen is built
on top of the well at 1802 Seventh. The kitchen first shows up on the 1901 Sanborn. The well isn’t on any Sanborn. One suggestion is that it was an outside well that was later enclosed.

Thurs. 16 June

Many of the pits across the site contain 1930s+ materials, which is a time when we would have expected the practice of dumping in your backyard to be dying out. Unless the houses weren’t lived in for a while because nobody had rent money in the Depression, and a bunch of old drunks crashed there? Or folks from elsewhere used them as rubbish dumps?

FIELDWORK WEEK 8, BLOCK 24
Mon. 20 June

A couple of firefighters told us that Well 599 at the back of the Pullman Hotel at 1802 Seventh had been dug up by bottle collectors, who also dug extensively behind the buildings along Seventh Street. This extensive pot-hunting was to be reconfirmed by a number of local visitors to the site during the week. Block 28 had also been pot-hunted. For now, in the well, we will fast screen only until we are at least 3 feet below the well top. By 4 feet below ground surface (bgs), no whole bottles had been found. We are using 1-foot arbitrary layers for now. Lots of ceramics with makers’ marks are coming up. Mostly we are finding plain white ware, with transfer print and banded items. Elyn Walker and Grace Ziesing are excavating the well.

At 1817 Goss, the bottom fill of suspected Privy 365 contained scrimshaw.

Tues. 21 June

There’s a tree dropping leaves on the site on a regular basis. It screws our photography. Revenge because we cut through some of its roots.

Thurs. 23 June

Aicha Woods was on site arranging site tour for local people with Elyn Walker for next Friday at 10 a.m. Ceramic marks from the Pullman Hotel Well 559: we have Clarke of Burslem, 1880-1887, and Anthony Shaw of England, 1890-1900, among others. This well is finished to 5 feet bgs and we will return to it in October with a machine after fire-station demolition.

Fri. 24 June

Block 24 seems extensively pot-hunted but there are a few places that have been missed. Janet
Pape contacted Don Hines, the Caltrans Safety officer for Cypress. Legally, apparently, we are not excavating wells, we are “cleaning them out.”

I finally got hold of the Dymo, printed out “Grace Ziesing, Project Manager” and stuck it on her hard hat. My new mantra will be, “Check with the Project Manager.” Grace can now field the public inquiries, drown in paperwork, and boss everybody around. She says she likes to organize, she must be a Scorpio. With Janet running interference as Caltrans Project Manager, I can switch to senior executive mode and lord it around the site, cup of tea and chocolate cookie in hand.

Wed. 29 June

Grace prepared what she calls a concordance—I thought that was something negotiated between the Vatican and the State of Israel—for Block 37. It lists all the contexts on the block in numerical order and indicates the pits where they can be found. As we are filing our context sheets by pit number, this will help locate specific contexts.

Thurs. 30 June

It was decided to scrap work on Block 17. The most interesting part of the ASA along the back of the lot has lead contamination levels over 3,000 ppm according to Caltrans plans. This is found in about 25% of our proposed trench. There are also pockets with levels of 1,600 ppm plus within 50 to 80 feet of the ASA. On this basis, it seems that the entire ASA could contain elevated levels of lead contamination. As the ASA consisted of just over one parcel and a part of the Oakland Pickle Works, we felt its potential importance did not justify having to suit up in the required personal-protective equipment.

Fieldwork Week 12, Block 11
Mon. 18 July

Today’s new arrival is Mike Stoyka. From a viewpoint of ethnic origins, this week’s crew now consists of two Germans, one Chinese, one Russian, and one Irishman and it’s 46% women. When it comes to being P.C., we are totally cool.

Block 11 Summary

It took 9 days to clear the site. We opened an area of about 90 feet x 80 feet and removed up to 3 feet or more of overburden. We identified about 40 pits and 1 privy, and house or other structural remains at 815 and 819 Union Street. Four test trenches were sunk in areas where there appeared to be low potential for destroying hollow/filled features. Three old freeway footings were uncovered. Although there can be areas of disturbance up to 6 feet wide, and sometimes larger, around the footing edges, some archaeological features such as pits and fence posts have survived between the footings. So archaeological materials
may have survived on Blocks 1, 2, and 3, where there are many such footings. The test trenches excavated to examine site stratigraphy show black, silty marsh sand, except at the eastern end of 815 Union. Here, test trench 782 was sunk to yellow Merritt sand, as seen on our previous blocks. It seems that we may have come down on the edge of the marsh in this block. The top of the Merritt sand does a gradual fade into the blacker silty sand towards the south. There was no evidence of prehistoric occupation. Two fragments of unworked obsidian, possibly Konociti, were found in the general fill deposits over the site.

**FIELDWORK BREAK**

**Fri. 12 August**

We have worked on five blocks so far during 12 weeks in the field and we have noted the following:

1. Preservation was best on Post Office parking lots sealed during the 1960s—Blocks 37 and 18.
2. Pot-hunting was fairly intense on one block demolished within the last year—Block 24.
3. Archaeological materials have survived between footings for the old Cypress freeway—Block 11.
4. The historic surface remnant has been found between 1 and 4 feet below current ground surface.
5. Getting rid of rubbish in backyard pits has been ongoing through the 1940s and occasionally later.
6. There has been no evidence of prehistoric occupation in situ.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 12, BLOCK 1**

**Mon. 22 August**

On site with Janet Pape, Mike Meyer, Nina Ilic. About 330 probe holes have been driven through the asphalt and 17 pits dug by pothunters. Fortunately, they placed their test grid about 10 to 15 feet north of the back fence line. Below a thin asphalt layer is a 6 to 12 inch deposit of darker brown sandy soil, overlying Merritt sand. This seems to be the historic surface remnant. It fits in with houses being leveled for freeway construction, then the entire block being graded and asphalted over.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 13, BLOCK 1**

**Mon. 29 Aug.**

The Gradall was spray-painted over the weekend. It must have taken several minutes to do and someone had to climb the fence. So where was the security guard? Asleep? I contacted the security company supervisor and he’s investigating. I expect to hear back from him shortly. I spoke with one of the guards when he arrived for the 4 p.m. shift. He had been on duty until midnight Sunday and said nothing had happened before that time. They are trying to locate the shift on which it happened. The state police came and took a statement.

**Wed 31 Aug.**

Finishing site cleaning. Used the Gradall to clear a safe working space around Well 968 at 812 Castro Street to about 5 feet in depth. We can now excavate the well like a chimney. Rest of the crew cleaning up the new Delphi oracle-style trench around Well 968.

**Thurs. 1 Sept.**

Set up a benchmark on site at the base of a freeway column at 667/663 Sixth Street. The elevation is 17 feet 7 inches ASL. Dug a rapid Gradall trench to check ground water, which was found at minus 3.5 inches ASL. Well 968 at 812 Castro was beginning to look a little shaky. The fill dried out and slumped almost 4 inches en masse to the west. We wrapped it up with a tarp, string, and bungee cords to you. While removing all the brickwork and exposing all the fills would make a great photo, the fill might spill out, so we will proceed bit by bit.

**Fri. 2 Sept.**

Well 968 at 812 Castro is looking good. Beneath about 3 feet of sheet metal and other amorphous iron are some turn-of-the-century bottles and ceramics and we still have 8 feet to go to water table. The well has been excavated as a standing column. All the brickwork is removed to expose the stratigraphy in total. This makes it real easy to excavate the fill from the outside.
FIELDWORK WEEK 15, BLOCK 1  
Fri. 9 Sept.
Continuing excavation. Privy 900 with Shannon Mahoney and Mary Ellen D’Agostino is finished and has produced a large quantity of pre-1900 good-quality material representing its better-off owners. In Well 968 at 812 Castro, three layers are currently visible. There’s about 2 feet of amorphous sandy fills over brick rubble with a metal crucifix. We also found a crucifix in Privy 900 at 654 Fifth St and another crucifix in Privy 955 at 671 Sixth St. At least three Catholics on this block should have taken better care of their rosaries.

FIELDWORK WEEK 16, BLOCK 1  
Fri. 16 Sept.
Richelle Coffin sank the probe to the hilt in Privy 953. That would put the bottom at least 10 feet bgs.

FIELDWORK WEEK 17, BLOCK 1  
Thurs. 22 Sept.
East Bay MUD finally turned up to show us where their underground pipes are located. They’re all under the street. I politely turned down their request for a souvenir bottle. But at least they asked first.

Fri. 23 Sept.
It rained for the first time since May.

FIELDWORK WEEK 18, BLOCKS 1 AND 24  
Fri. 30 Sept.
The Pullman Hotel well is now down into the ‘wet, smelly stuff,’ to quote its scientifically trained excavators. When the well is finished, we will have examined six wells so far. The way we excavate wells, by digging a wide safety-trench around them is a hit with site visitors. One commented, “It looks like a real archaeological site.” We are damned with well-meaning praise, so to speak.

FIELDWORK WEEK 19, BLOCKS 1, 24, AND 2  
Mon. 3 Oct.
The Pullman Hotel well on Block 24 was finished at midday. Not a great deal of artifacts. Mike Meyer dates them on a preliminary basis to before 1910.

Tues. 4 Oct.
Rain, rain, rain, followed by downpour, downpour. At least the wetness soaked up the waterfall of exhaust fumes that usually pours down from I-980 on our hard-hat heads. Normally by 4 p.m. most of us are as high as kites, unless the sea breeze blows in and sweeps the murk away. Hey, it’s a job.

FIELDWORK WEEK 20, BLOCK 2  
Thurs. 13 Oct.
Machine clearance ongoing, possibly seven privies showing up. Noelle from the Gingerbread House opposite the site on Fifth and Brush came over to complain about the dust. I said we’d try and move the excavated soil pile away from opposite her restaurant on Monday with the dozer, which we’ll have then for backfilling Block 1. She’s closed Mondays. She’s dealt with Caltrans on this before when the freeway was demolished earlier this year. She brought us some gingerbread as a peace offering. Not bad, and of gingerbread, I’m a connoisseur.

FIELDWORK WEEK 21, BLOCK 2  
Tues. 18 Oct.
Going by the fence posts mostly at the rear of the Brush Street lots, I estimate the correct Sanborn lot boundaries to be 2 feet to 3 feet east and perhaps 1 foot north of our current string layout, which is based on the Caltrans survey crew’s measurements.

Wed. 19 Oct.
I contacted C.J. Vandegrift at Caltrans surveys about the accuracy with which the Sanborn boundaries were shot in with the laser gear. She said Blocks 1, 2, and 3 were a tough call, as there was not as much information available in Caltrans archives as for other blocks. She would not be surprised if the lot lines were a little out.
Keith Warren monitored the Gradall clearance of the overburden on the African American barber’s lot at 713 Sixth Street.

Thurs. 20 Oct.

Two African American soldiers, first lieutenants John Brown and Jacob Smith, were boarding at 812 Brush in 1900.

FIELDWORK WEEK 22, BLOCK 2
Tues. 25 Oct.

Someone had one hell of a party at 712 Fifth Street. Dar Rudnyckyj and Sonny Taonia came across maybe 100 stoneware beer bottles in the bottom of Privy 1409. The occupants we know of have Irish-sounding names, Foley in 1885 and Kelly in 1887.

Privy 1321 at 812 Brush, with possible African American associations, has a brick floor about 18 inches bgs with artifact-rich fill layers above. We will go through all these brick floors next week when all the site tours are over.

About 3.5 feet of fill deposits in Well 1300 slumped outwards real fast while we were removing brickwork to expose the stratigraphy. I tried holding it back along with Nina Ilic, while Mary Huffman went for a tarp and rope, but it was too heavy. We gave all the slumped material one context number and commenced stratigraphic excavation again at a height of 4 feet 10 inches AMSL, the bottom of the slumped material.

Sewerage plans—as opposed to sewerage pipes actually being put in—were adopted in West Oakland in 1875, as advertised when lots were being sold near Peralta. I have a copy of the seller’s advertisement on the wall at the lab. Presumably anything found under a brick-floored privy with an associated sewer pipe is earlier than ca. 1875.

Tues. 1 Nov.

It’s pouring down rain but Nina Ilic is happy because he’s working under the overhead freeway ramp. If my brain had functioned better, I would have dug Block 3 after Block 1, so we could have had a freeway ramp to dig under on Block 2 when it’s wet in December.

Wed. 2 Nov.

Rain, rain, rain and it was chillier than the stable at Bethlehem today. We now have an on-site fireplace in a 55-gallon drum we can retreat to when it all gets too much. Morale soars. BART passengers whizzing past the site must think we are a bunch of bedraggled hobos. Today’s highlight was a visit by a 6-year-old archaeological reincarnation and his mum, a friend of Cheryl Cook. He’s been digging up his backyard and recording everything he finds since the age of three. Damn, more competition years down the road.

Thurs. 3 Nov.

Oakland was a cold city this morning. Jack London was right, it’s a good place to start from. I told the crew they didn’t have to wet screen until the sun shone above their knees, so their feet don’t get too cold. Compassion is my middle name. A sewer contractor owned the lot at 814 Brush in 1887. Maybe he did the sewerage job on the brick-bottomed privies on the site.

FIELDWORK WEEK 24 BLOCKS 2 AND 3
Mon. 7 Nov.

Early morning was spent pumping out the site after the weekend’s winter storm dropped 6 inches of rain on San Francisco and the same on us. Mike Meyer laid out the ASA on Block 3.

Wed. 9 Nov.

The heavens opened and poured forth rain. Flash photos were in vogue all through this overcast day to match the flash floods. Nina Ilic and Rick Wolter had to concentrate on flood control all day, keeping water out of where we’re digging and manning (sorry, staffing) the pumps. All hands to the pumps, the site’s awash. But we were able to erect shelters over our major privies and keep going.

FIELDWORK WEEK 25, BLOCK 3
Wed. 16 Nov.

There was a rainstorm all day, but the backhoe kept working and Mike and Nina kept monitoring.
is potentially the best well yet. The backhoe then started to excavate a deeper safety trench around the well.

FIELDWORK WEEK 26, BLOCK 3
Mon. 21 Nov.
This block is being run by Mike Meyer as part of his Master’s thesis. I get to hover in the background.

Tues. 22 Nov.
Zipping along with Well 1700. The artifacts still look early.

Wed. 23 Nov.
The well got finished with artifacts right down to the bottom wet-screened silt deposits. A short week, it is Thanksgiving. I’m going to catch up on Block 2 paperwork, as I’m a heathen foreigner who doesn’t celebrate this holiday.

FIELDWORK WEEK 27, BLOCK 3
Wed. 30 Nov.
Trench 1755 at 768 Fifth St. cuts an earlier pit that contains a cow (deceased), apparently not butchered. On this site we have now uncovered a cow, a candle, and a chicken. There are dark murmurings of voodoo about. New site mantra—If you see the sun rise on your way to work, you’re late.

Thurs. 1 Dec.
The second half of a small Pit 1753 at 768 Fifth St. contained many artifacts, including about seven cylindrical stone objects that could be fishing weights, or possibly charmstones. Perhaps someone was raiding middens back in the last century. Nina Ilic is not sold on the charmstone idea. The pit previously produced a Chinese coin, so quite a cultural mix in this one.

Fri. 2 Dec.
The bones of Daisy, the deceased cow, have been boxed up by Elyn Walker and we are none the wiser as to how she got there.
FIELDWORK WEEK 28, BLOCK 3
Mon. 5 Dec.

Elyn Walker is digging what we are calling the sand well, 1703, at 812 Market. No brick or wood lining. There are few artifacts, but we will excavate the second half, stopping at our current 3 feet depth. The probe sinks in up to its hilt, but this well is unsafe to dig. There's no structure to support a 'chimney' if we dig around it with a machine. The 4-ft probe didn't reveal any brickwork or other lining to about 6.5 feet bgs.

Fri. 9 Dec.

We are finishing up the excavation today. The weather was sunny, but real cool. Just like us. Over and out on the 1994 fieldwork.

FIELDWORK WEEK 30, BLOCK 28
Mon. 17 April 1995

The 1995 fieldwork season begins after a four-month break while Caltrans and the construction contractor discussed how to remove the extensive fill material west of Market Street. On site at 7 a.m. with Janet Pape. Crew consists of Keith Warren, Rick Wolter, Nina Ilic, and Richelle Coffin.

Tues. 18 April

We established a site temporary benchmark (TBM) at exactly 13 feet AMSL on the concrete pad immediately west of the house lot on Pine Street. Also met the occupant, Vivienne, who brought the crew coke (ah, that's coca-cola) and orange juice. I asked her to let me know if dust or anything else bothered her.

We dug a test trench with the backhoe outside the ASA to look for stratigraphy and check the water table. The trench was about 8.5 feet deep. Ground water seeped in at a depth of 6 ft. 5 in. bgs. Relatively clean Merritt sand is at about 2 feet bgs in this area.

FIELDWORK WEEK 31, BLOCK 28
Mon. 24 April

Continuing machine clearance with two backhoes. The 710 John Deere arrived at 7:40 a.m. The operator is Peter, who says he's actually a crane operator. The house at 1825 Short was burnt on Friday night. The guard apparently did not put it in his report as Burns Security came by to investigate it. You'd think he would have put it in for the sheer entertainment value. The Fire Dept. also arrived. The house still stands but is a bit of a shell from the outside.

Wed. 26 April

Richelle Coffin checked and corrected the construction contractor, MCM's, bill for security that I have to sign off on daily. The security guards work 15 hours a day from 4 p.m. to 7 a.m. MCM had it figured as 11 hours. I asked MCM how they managed that. They said $4 + 7 = 11$. These guys are building the freeway...

Fri. 28 April

Only one backhoe arrived. After waiting a reasonable time, Richelle did battle over the phone with MCM (she says they left her on hold for nearly 10 minutes, they said they got cut off). They eventually sent an emissary around to fill us in and/or ameliorate us. It's lucky I was there as Richelle was ready to fill him in. The story is the new backhoe operator didn't show up at their yard until 9 a.m., then they had to drug test him.

I'm updating this on Sunday 30 April. I had to go back to the site at 6 p.m. on Friday and I had told the guard to expect me. I mustn't have made much of an impression as he was fast asleep in his truck. Then on Saturday at 12:45 p.m., Richelle was at the site and found another guard asleep. I called Bayshore Security and the secretary directed me to their voice-mail. I left a message that if we find a guard asleep again, we will get another security firm.

FIELDWORK WEEK 32, BLOCK 28
Tues. 2 May

A Channel 7 crew came by. The cameraman was filming the small green house on Pine Street that people are trying to save from demolition. The TV crew then came to the site gate. Elyn Walker talked to them and offered them a Caltrans contact but they disappeared without taking the guy's
name. The 710 John Deere backhoe blew a hose at 10 a.m. It is now 2 p.m. and no fix. MCM apparently called the wrong rental company to come fix it. On it goes. Some details on the new mobile phone: To activate the phone, we had to fax my driver’s license, then they called us back to check. I was off the site, so British citizen Keith successfully impersonated me on the grounds that the locals wouldn’t know one foreigner from another.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 34, BLOCK 28**

Mon. 15 May

Crew: Keith Warren, Peter Messick, Brian Mischke, Laura Villamil, Bill Stillman, Dave Makar, Anmarie Medin. Richelle Coffin ill today. Paula Frazer had prior Archaeology Week commitments at the Presidio.

Keith and Bill are starting on Well 2000 at 1820 Goss St. This well rapidly turned out to be a dud. Plastic bags and generally late materials through the first 5 feet of fill. A 1938 penny was also found. As the well got into water table, it began to smell bad and excavation was halted. The odor resembled diesel to some noses and sewage to others, especially to Dave Makar’s nose. Dave’s nose has been near enough sewage in his former plumbing profession, so he wins out. There is no evidence of a diesel slick in the well water.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 35, BLOCK 28**

Wed. 24 May

One visitor today, Emeritus Professor Paul Zinke, a former professor of soil science from UCB who hangs out at Peter Messick’s bar. He was enraptured by the site, not having seen such large soil exposures before, so we invited him back with his camcorder any time.

Earthmoving equipment is now nibbling away at Block 4. There is some question of our working on this block at the same time as the pile-drivers. Apart from the infernal noise, I think we have a case for our sections collapsing every time a pile is smacked and the earth vibrates. On these grounds, I would hope we could work in peace.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 36, BLOCKS 27 AND 31**

Tues. 30 May

Site visitor, John Apostolis, who is chief of construction in Sacramento. He was in town and wanted to know what we were up to. Janet showed him around. He asked her, humorously I hope, who
to blame if the archaeologists delayed the job. Janet handed him her business card. Looks like we’re in the clear then.

**Wed. 31 May**

ABC TV on site filming women crew as part of an affirmative-action program. Bill Coburn from Oakland Heritage Alliance dropped in while visiting the houses to be saved across the street.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 37, BLOCKS 27 AND 31**

Wed. 7 June

Pits ongoing. We are on schedule to start backhoe clearance of Block 4 on Monday 12 June. Our media day is rescheduled for next Wednesday, 14 June. Kasler Construction are apparently complaining to Caltrans that the archaeology is holding them up. They have no grounds. There is a 50-day construction lockout in this area initiated by Caltrans, and we are digging blocks in the order requested. Elyn Walker’s car was stolen from the Days Inn parking lot overnight. The security guards and/or camera don’t appear to have seen much.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 38, BLOCKS 27 AND 31**

Wed. 14 June, Media Day

The weather was overcast and showery. The Media arrived at 10:00 and remained until 12:45, along with Bob Gross and the Caltrans press officers. Media present included Channels 2, 4, 5, and 7, Associated Press, East Bay Express, and several other local papers. Medin, Hellmann, Stillman, Meyer, Makar, Coffin, Messick, Longfellow, Warren, Walker, and Mischke got to be media stars for a day.

**Fri. 16 June**

Block 4: At 12:15 the office arrived on our new site and there was great rejoicing.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 38, BLOCK 4**

Thurs., 22 June

TV morning-show host Tracy Gallagher wants to do a shoot on the site. I suggested that she hold off until there was more to see and that I’d phone her 4-5 days in advance when we had a better block. Caltrans video person comes and we film 15 minutes around the site. Mary Praetzellis reports that a visiting archaeologist saw what he took to be a “layer of shell” in the side of a trench between BART and the Post Office building on Seventh. Nina Illic was informed; he checked out the area and found nothing.

Bill Levinson came for filming in afternoon. We went by Block 27. It is untouched from when we left and this after all the pressure to get us out by last Friday because we were “holding up the contractor.”

**Tues. 18 July**

Yesterday Warren rode BART by the site at 4:15 p.m. and saw the security supervisor lock the gate and leave.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 43, BLOCK 7**

Mon. 24 July

Return of jet-lagged, culture-shocked field boss from European vacation musing over job offer in French Riviera. At SSU in the morning sorting out my immigration status after U.S. Immigration at pre-flight clearance in Dublin kindly permitted me, after some hesitation, to enter the U.S. until 31 July.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 44, BLOCK 7**

Tues. 1 Aug.

At about 10:30, I got paged by Janet Pape. Janet had been ordered to close us down. Reasons currently unclear. The decision-makers apparently thought we were out of money.

**Wed. 2 Aug.**

Job wise, we seem saved for the moment. The state budget was passed this morning so on we roll until the next crisis. We had a problem of a different sort this morning. Mike Meyer was first at the site hut. The security guard was asleep. Mike managed to load tools from the container and take the guard’s photograph without waking her. I met him at Block 4 where we both noticed that the site looked a little different. Pothunters had been there. Two of the best-
looking privies and a pit were hit. Privy 3300 at 828 Myrtle had been trashed to a depth of about a foot. The east half of Privy 3178 had been mostly dug out to Merritt sand. We photographed them and Bill Levinson put them on video later. After cleaning both privies up, we can save something from each. I contacted Janet Pape and asked her to terminate the security firm’s contract and get us a new one by this evening.

Fri. 4th Aug
Looking through the block reports since I was gone, I noticed that we had one instance of a posthole eligible for the National Register. Being of a scientific bent, I am waiting to see the documentation and photos of this phenomenon. There are 146 lots still to do in the remaining blocks.

FIELDWORK WEEK 45, BLOCK 4
Mon. 7 Aug.
The large LPG gas container, the camp stove, and the wheelbarrow purchased last week were stolen over the weekend. This is not an auspicious beginning for the new guards. Their boss came around to hand in guard reports and I told him what had happened. We got the usual apologies. I asked for the guard to be stationed by the site hut overlooking the site rather than at the front gate on Market Street.

Tues. 8 Aug.
Pile-driving has started beside our trenches just west of Market Street. We will be able to monitor the impact on the standing sections in the ineligible pits. So far it is real noisy but not continuous. Still, only one pile-driver is working so far. Four more are lining up. Today was hot yet nobody wanted to use the shade. Are they afraid of looking like wimps? About half an obsidian projectile point turned up in the landfill from Block 4. Found by Janet Pape no less, on the side of the trench.

Wed. 9 Aug.
The guy operating the pile-driver close to us lost control and the pile took off swinging around with bits of metal flying about. Our crew had to run fast and the construction workers also got the hell out of there. Said from MCM told me later that the operator had been freshly trained and pulled the wrong lever or something. I asked for a copy of the Caltrans safety report on the incident. No one was hurt. The operator was fired and a 20-year pile-driving veteran replaced him. Crew finishing the final pits on Block 4 to the melodious accompaniment of pile-driving, while a lucky few are cleaning up in the quiet environment of Block 5.

Fri. 11 Aug.
We had a Caltrans film crew on site this morning. They were focusing on road works but wanted to shoot us too (in the artistic sense). Janet Pape and Mike Meyer talked to them.

Tues. 15 Aug.
I checked Block 29 with Mike Meyer. There’s still a large concrete pad to come up. Word from Janet at the end of the day was that Caltrans would like us to work on Blocks 6 and 29 at the same time. Block 29 will be available next Wed. 23. Scotty Thompson took a few runs on BART between West Oakland and 12th Street to shoot the site with his video camera. Apart from newspaper articles, this is how the public see us. A fleeting glimpse, if they even are aware of what’s going on. We can post this out on our Web page when it is set up. I am advised that my work-permit extension has arrived. Cool. Now instead of having to go work in Europe, I get to actually choose between downtown Oakland and the south of France. Lucky me, the American dollar or the French Riviera.

FIELDWORK WEEK 46, BLOCKS 5 AND 29
Wed. 16 Aug.
The pile-driver was banging away all day. Was it my imagination that the ground must have been harder because the bangs and booms seemed louder? So far this week it has been suggested that we: (a) speed the project up and have two crews working at the same time; (b) slow the project down and lay people off to save money. And it’s still only Wednesday.

Thurs. 17 Aug.
A few employees of Southern Pacific questioned Dave Makar about his presence on Block 29 when he returned there later in the day. This is
good news, it means they keep an eye on things. Or does it mean Dave looks like a hoodlum to Joe Citizen?

**Fieldwork Week 47, Blocks 5 and 6**

**Tues. 22 Aug.**

Block 6. We have about a dozen privies now all hiding around the center of the block. Damn, I spelt ‘centre’ as ‘center’ without a second thought. Creeping acculturation.

**Wed. 23 Aug.**

Medin on site. Troweling Block 6. Keith Warren hit the first privy and it was a 1920s dud, 1 down, 11 or so to go. Kaser apparently chased a few self-described “amateur archaeologists” off Block 29 last night according to Janet Pape. I don’t know if they did much damage. After checking Block 5 context sheets, I figured that the following points needed to be re-emphasized.

1. **Interpretation:** This means what it says. ‘Don’t have a clue’ will even do if you really have no idea of how the deposit got there.
2. **Handwriting:** Write clearly, especially numbers, which are easily confused. Yes, we are a multicultural society but please write in clear English so someone else can read your notes. Judging by your hieroglyphic scribbles, some of you appear to be reincarnated Egyptians.
3. **Orientation:** Don’t put a vertical north arrow on section drawings. Magnetic north is not located in the atmosphere above West Oakland.

**Fieldwork Week 48, Blocks 6, 5-2, and 29**

**Tues. 29 August**

Lunchtime on Block 6 was memorable. While the crew was sitting in front of the office trailer, someone came onto the site and stole four toolboxes. Samantha Schell, Conrad Praetzel, Meagan Wehrstedt, and Brian Mischke lost their toolkits. Fortunately, Pete Messick had taken the cameras off site. Reported theft to Janet and she called Oakland Police Dept. This project is getting expensive for the crew.

**Wed. 30 August**

There was a portion of a human skull in a pit series being dug by Conrad Praetzel and Elyn Walker at 815 Filbert on Block 6. Elyn Walker, our osteological expert, reckons there’s an 80% probability that it is a European or other non-Native American adult. This is based on skull and incisor shape and the fact that the sutures are closed. Janet Pape informed the coroner and Adrian Praetzelli at SSU. Kevin Hinckle, Deputy Coroner from the Sheriff’s Department, County of Alameda, arrived on site around 4:30 p.m. He took a statement from Elyn and photographed the pit in which the human remains were found. He would like an osteology report from us. We have no dating evidence yet. Mr. Hinckle thought he was required to contact Native American representative Andrew Galvan. I think he may be holding off on that based on assurances from Elyn and Janet that the probability of the remains being European made that unnecessary.

Figure E.5, Jennifer Ferneau and crew on Block 5 with a pile-driver in the background
Thur. 31 Aug

The pile-driver has moved practically inside the site hut on Block 6. We will be billing for large doses of aspirin.

FIELDWORK WEEK 49, BLOCK 6

Wed. 6 Sept.

It was real hot today and it felt like the pile-driver was just outside the front door of the site office. We have more bits and pieces of the deceased person, plus a belt buckle. I don’t recall seeing any particularly early materials come from the burial fill. We should have the burial excavation complete by tomorrow.

FIELDWORK WEEK 50, BLOCKS 6 AND 29

Wed. 11 Sept.

Ongoing excavation on Blocks 6 and 29, with a peak of 20 crew in the field this week. The backhoe cleared around the well at the Railroad Hotel on Block 29 and initially it looks promising. Historian Roger Olmsted visited the site today to share his thoughts, which also run towards foul play with the burial. The boots should help with dating. Pits ongoing. Messick digging when not photographing. Coffin purchasing supplies and checking concordance and photo logs. I mention them specifically as they tend not to turn up in the status report as they both have primary non-digging duties. And when their grandchildren ask “What did you do in the dig, Grandpa/ma/?,” I don’t want them getting on my case.

Fri. 13 Sept.

We may be looking at about 10 apparently eligible privies plus the burial on Block 6. Block 29 is styling’. The Railroad Hotel well is stratified with a high artifact density. The technical term used by the crew is ‘Yumba.’ I actually pushed a couple of wheelbarrows today to rapturous crew applause. Life goes on at Cypress.

Thurs. 14 Sept.

Close to finishing Block 6. Site visitors Adrian Praetzellis and Judy Tordoff from Caltrans, Sacramento, checking feature eligibility. Three more privies bit the dust to much weeping among the crew. Elyn Walker’s stolen car was recovered by the police. The person who stole it had replaced the tires and hubcaps, put in an ace stereo system, and kindly retained the license plates while parking it outside his house. This month’s Darwin award has a winner.

Fri. 15 Sept.

At the end of the day we ran some controls on Block 6. As the ASA on Block 6 will be totally wiped out by heavy machinery on Monday, Keith Warren, Dave Makar, and myself dug the remaining unexcavated and presumed ineligible pits as fast as possible. We called it right, they were all ineligible, with either late or very few materials.

Block 29: Well 4600 continues down and contains more textiles, seeds, and similar, including coats and hats. Excavation stopped to allow the screening to catch up. Approximately 2 feet of fill is left in the well, as per probe-check to the bottom of the brick.

FIELDWORK WEEK 51, BLOCK 29

Mon. 18 Sept.

The Railroad Hotel well was finished today. It bottomed out at about 3 feet below sea level. Information from Sunshine Pota is that she dates the shoes from the burial in trench/pit 4301 on Block 6 to no earlier than 1897. This is apparently based on the rubber heels being no earlier than 1897 and aspects of the style being no later than 1916, if I remember correctly. The burial cut through a privy containing a bourbon bottle dating to 1888-1893, so

Figure F.6. Plates discarded in Well 4600 at the rear of the Railroad Exchange Hotel on Block 29
it has to be later than 1888. The Corbett family were on site from 1875 through the 1900 census. So maybe the three gentlemen who were at this address in the 1910 census knew something about it. That’s Frank Hubert, a gardener, Shubert Belisle (?), a carpenter, and William Marrd, a grocery porter who lived at 815-1/2.

Wed. 21 Sept.

Mike Jablonowski arrived on site at 10.30 am with his ASC field intern class from Anthro 496/596, Madeleine Solomon and Mary Fry. They got a tour and got put to work until 3 p.m. as artifact screeners.

**Fieldwork Week 52, Blocks 29 and 22**

Mon. 25 Sept.

Bill Stillman found a Napa Valley obsidian serrated projectile point in the builder’s trench fill of Privy 4736 at 1868/70 Seventh Street. It may have been a collector’s item or, as it was found in the builder’s trench fill, it might have been scooped up from the surrounding area.

Wed. 27 Sept.

We coned off the entire Post Office Block 22 area that we are interested in at shift change today at around 2:30-4 p.m. That got most of the parked cars out of the way and we will check that the remainder depart tomorrow. Stoyka did public relations, telling people they couldn’t park there during the shift change. Mike Meyer’s wedding is becoming increasingly inconvenient, he is needed on site. I think we should tell him to cancel it.

Thurs. 28 Sept.

Last night’s barriers on Block 22 got pushed aside by delirious postal workers desperate for a parking spot. Meanwhile, oblivious to them all, BART whizzes past overhead. We put the barriers back up. We barricaded the two routes into the ASA as best we could. It is now very obvious that no one is supposed to park in there so we await the dawn with interest.

**Fieldwork Week 53, Block 22**

Mon 2 Oct.

One disgruntled postal worker parked within our fenced-off area. I left a note on his/her windscreen. Dick McCombe said some comments from local postal workers were, “Why spend money on this stuff when this area needs it for schools?” We’re all about education, so perhaps the Caltrans display should be moved into the Post Office for a week? I monitored on Block 22. It was hotter than hell and I’m not used to being sweaty and dusty anymore.

Tues. Oct. 3rd

No obvious privies so far on the Chinese laundry.

Fri. Oct. 6th

Janet will contact TV morning show host Tracy Gallagher from Channel 4. She inquired on 22 June if she could film us. We now have a site with something to catch the public’s eye. The Chinese laundry now has a well, and two possible privies.

**Fieldwork Week 54, Block 22**

Mon. 9 Oct.

Crew cleaning Well 5260 in the Chinese laundry address. We put Nina Ilic’s muscle to good use on the bucket brigade hauling dirt out from the well. Tracy Gallagher from KRON Channel 4 affiliate, Channels 60 and 35, wants to do a live program from the site on Wednesday morning. Her technician will be there from 5:30 a.m. Janet and I will be there, the crew have the option of arriving by 6:15 if they want national fame.

Wed. 11 Oct.

On site with Janet at 5:30 am. Meyer arrived by 6 and the rest of the crew by 6:15. The show went well. They did three live segments from the site. Janet will get a copy of the tape from the TV station. Excavation ongoing. Chinese laundry site steadfastly refusing to be Chinese and Jeannie Yang is getting frustrated as a potential Master’s thesis goes out the window.
Fri. 13th

Victor Salazar came by to check progress on the backfilling. We could not complete it by the end of the day and it will continue on Monday. However, we are doing the best job we can and there is no rain forecast for the weekend. If it does pour down, and we pollute Lake Merritt, I think Janet gets hauled off to jail before I do. Brief update on previous blocks:

Block 6 had 109 features with a potential for excavation; 37 were dug and my latest figures indicate 6 were apparently eligible. Fourteen lots were examined.

Block 29 had 156 features with a potential for excavation; 47 were dug and 10 were apparently eligible. Nine lots were examined.

Fieldwork Week 55, Block 22

Mon 16 Oct.

There is a long trench (5237) at 1813 Seventh. It contains a lot of burnt wood and a pit across its northern end had some celadon fragments. It may contain demolition debris from the Chinese laundry, so we will excavate sections of this trench. The trench may have been some kind of a drain. It seems too irregular to have been a wall foundation.

Wed. 18 Oct.

Crew focused on excavation of Trench 5237 on the Chinese laundry site. Maybe we found no Chinese artifacts in the well at 1823 Seventh because the laundry was using the well and made sure no junk went in it. Judging by the amount of brick demolition debris, burnt redwood, and Asian ceramics in Trench 5237, I think the laundry had a major fire, after which it was demolished and bits of it shoved into what may once have functioned as a drainage trench. The result of this is the debris in Trench 5237. I presume that happened by 1912, as the laundry is not on that year’s Sanborn. We are wet-screening everything from Trench 5237, mostly through 1/4-inch mesh with some sample 1/8 inch. We are finding lots of bright blue, marble-sized balls, ‘Laundry Blue.’ Warren and Stoyka are excavating and Stillman is organizing the wet-screening.

Thur. Oct. 19th

Excavation continuing on Trench 5237. Celadon bowls, Chinese brown-glazed stoneware and possible wooden abacus beads have been found. We have only three potentially eligible features from Block 22 to date: Pit 5293 and Trench 5237 from 1813 Seventh, the address of the Chinese

Figure F.7. Channel 4’s morning news program live from Block 22
laundry, and Pit 5200 from behind the Buhsen Hotel at 1803-5 Seventh Street.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 56, BLOCKS 22 AND 25**

Mon. 23 Oct.

Channel 4 came on site about 1 p.m. and did some background filming with Janet Pape. By some inexplicable freak of nature, all context sheets were checked and the site matrix completed by the day excavation finished on Block 22. This is a historical first. It is also an historical last, so don’t expect it to happen again.

Thurs. 26 Oct.

Fourteen cars were parked in our ASA on Block 25 this morning. I couldn’t get through to Dick McCombe, so I contacted Post Office Security, who put out a P.A. announcement. It took until 1 p.m. to get all but one car removed.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 57, BLOCK 25**

Tues. 31 Oct.

Halloween. The spooks will get wet tonight, it started to rain late in the afternoon. Our first wet time since around April or early May. We’re clearing up to 2 feet of overburden from the Block 25 site. At the end of the day we had maybe 35% of the ASA cleared. Lots of demolition debris, some brick foundations. Nina Lalic was a whiz kid and connected the generator so we have light and heat in our executive office.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 58, BLOCK 25**

Mon. 6 Nov.

Backhoe on site 7:20-3:30. We wanted it to stay another half hour to tidy things up but the operator said he was off the clock and left. The Union rules.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 61, BLOCK 25**

Fri 30 Nov.

We finished with only two apparently eligible pits on Block 25. Many pits were disturbed, presumably by pothunters probing in the vicinity of the rear fence line. This may have happened after the buildings on this block were demolished to make way for the current freeway project. On Block 25, we labored mightily and brought forth little. The site matrix was complex: lots of late disturbances and sewer trenches cutting across lots. I will be in Palm Springs doing exotic yoga stuff from 24 Dec. through 2 Jan. This should clear my brain out sufficiently that I can deal with the remaining blocks in pouring rain, howling bay winds, biting cold, and moaning crew.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 62, BLOCK 20**

Wed. 3 Jan. 1996

Keith Warren and Rick Wolter laid out Block 20 on the ground. Backhoe will remove asphalt tomorrow.

Thurs. 4 Jan.

Warren monitoring backhoe on Block 20.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 63, BLOCK 20**

Wed. 10 Jan.

Backhoe on site clearance from 7 a.m.-9 a.m. Mike Meyer dropped by and informed us that the 1886 block books held at the Oakland Cultural Heritage Alliance with Betty Marvin and friends apparently indicate the location of wells with an ‘x’. He only looked at a couple of blocks. Coffin will check

Thurs. 11 Jan.

Surprisingly warm for a California winter. Warren tells me that Adam Jackson, the 4 p.m. to midnight security guard, was approached by Post Office police after we had gone for the day. The cops told him that a senior postal person would be coming on to the site to look for bottles. The guard told the cops that he would be arrested if he did so. Coffin checked out the “wells on Block books theory” at Betty Marvin’s. The ‘x’ marking the spot are actually poorly written ‘Ts’, says Betty Marvin and mean “tenant.” Betty Marvin says wells were never shown. Too bad.

Fri. 12 Jan.

Block 20. Early-morning entertainment was provided by an SPRR person getting irate. He
wanted the railroad to bring in a surveyor at the weekend to peg out and reclaim its property on Block 20. Apparently part of the western half of this block is SPRR property, which the Post Office has been using for ages. What I took to be the edge of the right-of-way on construction plans was in fact the edge of a “permit to enter” zone, which Caltrans can use for access during construction. I don’t recall having seen the words “permit to enter” on the construction plans when we were figuring out impact areas previously. Maybe I was looking at the wrong ones. Unseasonably warm for January, we were working in T-shirts for part of the day.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 64, BLOCK 20**

Tues. 16 Jan

Heavy rain overnight puddled parts of the site. Torrential rain this morning. Although the site appears to drain well, it was not possible to work in this weather. Bill Levinson filmed between showers. Our rain shelters broke apart over the long weekend. Ilic is designing a stronger version.

Jan. 17th

Stoyka is in ecstasy. After pulling dud pits for months, he finally looks to have a good privy to excavate.

Fri. 19 Jan.

The sun sort of shone. Well, there was a faint glow in the southern sky. It could have been a nuclear reactor going berserk in San Jose.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 65, BLOCK 20**

Tues. 23 Jan.

Excavation, backhoe-clearance, and rain-shelter construction ongoing. It rained heavily from 1:30 p.m., but the rain shelters seem effective. But the crew members troweling-off 1827 William for a photo got soaked.

Wed. 24 Jan.

It poured down rain all morning. The shelters are working and excavation kept going. However, Makar’s Privy 6298 got swamped, as we were still building a shelter for it.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 66, BLOCK 20**

Tues. 30 Jan.

Rainstorm hit around 2 p.m.

Wed. 31 Jan.

Heavy rain in the morning after an overnight downpour flooded parts of the site, including a number of pits. We bailed, pumped, and dug enough drains to be able to keep working. The ground is saturated and slow to drain. Privy assessments now give us four potentially eligible features. We have averaged about 3.5 weeks per block so far. Block 20 has been our largest surface exposure so far and wet weather could delay us a little.

Fri. 2 Feb.

We may have a fourth eligible privy at 1825-23 William Street. Stoyka found what seems to be a gold ring with entwined hearts in it. We have finished work in the area owned by SPRR and it can be backfilled Monday. We have excavated a few privies in lots with poor association, for example, 1827 William, as a control. While I’d like to think unexcavated features would remain intact for future generations, it’s more likely that construction crews will dig through them.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 67, BLOCK 20**

Mon. 5 Feb.

Warm day after weekend downpour. Sponged out, pumped out, and bucketed the water away. We are now excavating by digging fast and stockpiling buckets of fill for a large wet-screen crew, rather than screening as we go. This suits the weather conditions better. Privies and pits are dug faster and sections exposed to possible rain and flooding collapse for less amount of time. We will tackle Jack London’s lot at 807 Pine tomorrow. Cookie Him will work with us on this lot for the rest of the week.

Tues. 6 Feb.

The crew troweled-off Jack London’s lot at 807 Pine. Nothing too exciting showing, just one more pit found.
Wed. 7 Feb.

Initial excavation of possible Privy 6441 and Pit 6442 on Jack London's lot at 807 Pine is producing late materials.

Thur. 8 Feb.

Adrian Praetzellis on site playing Doctor Doom with potentially eligible privies. Some of our excavators get emotionally attached to their privy candidates and get depressed if they get junked. I should keep a bunch of Prozac handy. Caltrans has distributed a memo dated yesterday informing all and sundry that the archaeologists would finish work in mid-March. Janet had faxed everyone our mid-April finishing schedule on 31 January.

Fri. 9 Feb.

It seems there is evidence to reconfirm the location of prehistoric site CA-ALA-17. At about 11 a.m., Mike Almeida came to the site. He said that an electrician had found some bones when digging a hole earlier this week. He took them home. Someone told him they were human. So he must have told his employer. The police, the coroner, and Andrew Galvan were then contacted. Someone then thought it a good idea to contact us. There was a meeting at the burial location site at the USPS building at Seventh and Adeline at 11:30 today. Among those present were Andrew Galvan, Bill Self, George Miller, Nina Ilic, Mike Meyer, and Janet Pape. The burial is still partly in the ground in a 6 ft. hole just about 100 ft. outside the right-of-way in the southeast corner of the USPS training center. Janet has confirmed that it will be a Caltrans project. Presumably freeway construction necessitated some wiring alterations at the USPS.

Excavation is complete at Jack London’s former childhood home at 807 Pine. The best we can offer for show-and-tell is an Owl Drug Company bottle with an adhesive label, which may date to ca. 1890 to 1930s. Beyond that, the earliest material is an Alameda Soda Water Co. bottle from ca. 1904. The Call of the Wild didn’t leave much behind.

FIELDWORK WEEK 68, BLOCK 20

Tues. 13 Feb

The deal with the burial on USPS property is that Andrew Galvan will contact the Native American Heritage Commission to find the most likely descendant and they will keep Janet Pape informed.

Wed. 14 Feb.

Update on the Native American burial is that it is on federal land and Larry Myer from the Native American Heritage Commission thinks the Post Office should handle it. Apparently the Post Office didn’t tell the Caltrans engineers they were planning to dig there because it was such a small area.

Thurs. 15 Feb.

Backhoe on site from 7-5:30 to finish clearance on Block 21. Makar stayed late to monitor. There are now four wells and about six to nine possible privies. Crew finalizing excavation on Block 20. Various amounts of Chinese ceramics, including celadon bowls, brown-glazed stoneware, and an almost intact soy pot, have been found in a number of pits on 1813 William. There is no information available to us indicating Chinese occupants and none of the excavated features have been eligible.

After a week of record heat for February, it started to rain again this afternoon. Messick and I were able to get some aerial shots of Blocks 20 and 21 from the top of the new postal parking facility. However, it was raining and light conditions were not good.

Benchmark established on Pine Street edge of Block 21 is 9 ft. 2 in. ASL to the nearest inch. Groundwater level in the sump trench is at 1 ft. 1 in. ASL. Top of the wells is at about 6 ft. 8 in. ASL, so one set of trenching with the backhoe should be enough to excavate the wells.

FIELDWORK WEEK 70, BLOCK 21

Mon. 26 Feb.

Crew troweling-off the double lot at 1776 Atlantic, and 1781 William. Real cold in the morning so the exercise will keep them warm. I laid out as much of Block 19 as possible with Meyer. There is a
blocked storm drain on the block within our ASA. The resulting flooded area is known to the locals as Lake Victor, after the resident engineer for Contract B.

Tues. 28 Feb
Kasler dropped off more sandbags to pack around the base of the back-dirt pile. We have a total of 97 sandbags, for which we will be billed over three bucks each. Nothing is free.

Thurs. 29 Feb.
On site, it was a dark and stormy night,... day, actually, though the clouds were dark enough. There may yet be some hope for this lot. We have five privies with apparently intact lower deposits and wood linings surviving intact under one to several feet of later disturbance. Which is a bit of an oxymoron as there is no such thing as earlier disturbance. The paperwork crew, Medin, Stoyka, Praetzel, and Wolter, are working stoically in the rain. The pit diggers get to work under shelters.

**Fieldwork Week 71, Block 21**
Mon. 4 March
Heavy rain for most of the day. Dan Bedford and his backhoe still managed to dig safety trenches around the wells at 812 and 814 Pine. There was a partial collapse of well fill while excavating Well 7097 at 814 Pine.

Tues. 5 March
The site looked unusual at 7 a.m. Two rain shelters were impaled on the now-bent site fence, which is 6 feet high. Two others were ripped apart in the middle of the site. Keith eventually found a fifth one a couple of hundred yards away by Seventh Street. It had to blow over the fence to get there. The mind boggles. Gerry from the post office said there was a fierce hail storm with high winds about 5 p.m. yesterday and he saw a couple of shelters ripped loose from their sandbags. Nina had to go home for his power tools and then spent much of the day fixing them. We can’t operate without them in the rain. We will use extra sandbags in future. There were about six or seven boarders on the well site lot at 803 Wood St. in 1900, so I presume there was a boarding house there, probably for rail workers. It’s a big lot with a big house on the 1889 Sanborn.

Thurs. 7 March
Springtime takes us unawares. Dry warm weather helped as we hit the wells. The well at 803 Wood is a dud. Only one ink-bottle out of the entire fill. It was excavated to about 10 feet bgs.

---

Figure F.8. “The Archaeologist as Artist” — depth of field experiment on Block 21. L to R: Bill Stillman, Mike Stoyka, Anmarie Medin, Brian Mischke, Ginger Hellman.
**FIELDWORK WEEK 72, BLOCK 21**

**Tues. 12 March**

Cold with showers on and off all day. After Makar and Mischke both fell into water-filled privies, which were excavated last week, I had the backhoe backfill them. There are still a few left open but they are visually obvious. The site now looks like Flanders Fields after aerial bombardment in the first world war.

**Thurs. 14 March**

Warm and sunny. Most of the crew spent a physical day doing bucket brigade from the well at 812 Pine after the backhoe cleared a deep safety trench around it. The area looks like a ziggurat in reverse. The well bottomed at 8 feet 9 inches below sea level, which I think makes it the deepest on the project. We wound up using every bucket, wheelbarrow and trash bin available to store the excavated material for wet-screening. It was important to get it out fast to avoid pumping the well more often than we have to.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 73, BLOCK 21**

**Mon. 18 March**

We have a tightly dated 1901 bottle among a number of other possible turn-of-the-century bottles in the well at 812 Pine. Plus paint cans and paint brushes. According to Mike Meyer's research at the Oakland Public Library, the German family Weinheimer (more likely Weisheimer), who were there during the 1900 census, sold the lot in 1903 to Jefferson D. King. Mr. Weisheimer was a house painter, so it looks like his family's stuff.

**Tues. 19 March**

It has been difficult to excavate wells in a stratigraphic fashion once we get into water-logged deposits, although we won't give up trying if we find any more.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 74, BLOCK 21**

**Fri. 29 March**

In the cleared area of the ASA there are nine probable privies and a bunch of pits. We also have brick foundations showing at 1769, 1771, 1773 and 1775 Atlantic, plus 768 Pine. These foundations correspond to the locations of houses shown on the 1889 Sanborn. This is the biggest run of foundations we have yet found.

**FIELDWORK WEEK 75, BLOCK 19**

**Mon. 1 April**

We must have upset the gods. Intermittent rain in the morning became heavy downpours in the afternoon. The backhoe and truck quit at 12 noon. Somewhere in the storm drains, there's a block or
a broken pipe. It backed up dramatically and the storm drain in the middle of the block turned into a mini-geyser. Our pumps couldn’t cope and most of the site was under a foot of water by 2:30. We had managed to get some site shovel work done, mostly scraping off and exposing brick foundations. Terry Heffernan from Kasler and Bill Shedd from Caltrans came by to inspect the damage. They will bring a large pump and drop it into our flooded storm drain. They can run an outlet hose about 400 feet north to a functioning drain. We can use our pumps to pump the rest of the flood into the misbehaving drain on site.

Tues. 2 April
Terry Heffernan from Kasler brought a couple of laborers and a pump at about 6:45. With their pump and our two, the site was drained by around 10:30.

Wed 3 April
It took 6.5 days to clear an area of 100 feet x 150 feet x 2.5 feet average depth. We have 19 possible privies on this block.

Fri. 5 Apr.
I like the idea of finishing up back on the block we started on. It rounds off the project and lets us see how far we have come with our technique and recording systems.

FIELDWORK WEEK 76, BLOCK 19
Mon 8 Apr.
We decided to have a temporary concrete plug inserted into the storm drain in the middle of the block. The surrounding streets drain off faster than our site and they don’t have to be troweled-off afterwards. Mike Forner and Victor Salazar assured me it won’t rain anymore. Which I am not inclined to believe.

Tues. 9 April
Stoyka’s Privy 8214 at 764 Pine is going down at least 8 feet bgs when probed. The backhoe dug a safety trench around it. The wood lining is a substantial size. Stoyka thinks it’s a wood-lined well. The question is how to tell the difference between a wood-lined well and a wood-lined privy if there are no original privy deposits remaining? I have reduced the ASA on Block 18 to the bare minimum. It is now an area of about 60 feet x 60 feet immediately behind the ca. 1900 tenements along Wood Street. It should pick up the house and possible privy shown on the 1889 Sanborn.

Wed. 10 April
In Privy 8214 at 764 Pine, the wood terminates about 5 feet bgs and there is a circular, unlined well cut from this depth. I guess it was a well all along. One small prehistoric artifact was found in the top fill of Privy 8330 at 1773 Atlantic. It was probably someone’s souvenir. Nina reckons it’s a desert side-notched point, possibly dating to 1500 or later.

Thurs. 11 April
We are picking up white sand at the bottom of several privies at 1771, 1769, and 1767-65 Atlantic. We haven’t seen it before. A geologist on a nearby drilling crew thought the sand was formed naturally. This white sand smells bad. We took a sample of the stuff in case we get to analyze it later.

FIELDWORK WEEK 77, BLOCK 19
Tues. April 16th
We will try for after-exavcation shots on this block. These have generally been a luxury on this project in the past, for various unavoidable reasons involving logistics and scheduling. We just have not
been able to take the time to trowel-off the entire block after excavation.

Wed 17 April
Excavation ongoing under rain shelters. I decided we needed a deadline and I told the crew that Friday 3 May was it for fieldwork, whether we were finished or not. So we had best be finished

Thurs. 18 April
We just had an earthquake.

Fri. 19 April
Janet Pape and the Block 6 burial/murder story got a big photo spread in the Oakland Tribune. Apparently the coroner’s office is having to display the bones to the media.

Field Work Week 78, Blocks 18 and 19
Tues. 23 April
Final pits being excavated on Block 19 along with the privy on Block 18-1. Pit 8422, at 1767 Atlantic on Block 19 is within a house. It’s either real early or perhaps dug after demolition of the house. Or else the folks who lived there had real bad housekeeping habits.

Fieldwork Week 79, Blocks 18 and 19
Mon. 29 April
Last week in the field. Real hot for April. Some of the crew stayed cool by wet-screening. The rest stayed hot troweling-off 1765 Atlantic. Wet-screening is now complete. We have a well and a privy to be assessed.

Tues. 30 April
Another hot one. Crew in varying stages of recovery—or not—from last night’s festivities at the Pacific Coast Brew Company. Paperwork in the heat is a great cure for a hangover so they are finalizing paperwork for unexcavated pits on both blocks. A couple of construction workers were using a cherry picker to remove light poles near us. Makar went and chatted them up and I offered them 50 bucks to let us use it for half an hour. We got all the rubbish off site, cleaned up as best we could, and got a bunch of aerial photos cheap. These are working shots rather than finished excavation publication photos, but they should look good in a slide show. Record heat in the Bay area, about 90 degrees in Oakland.

Wed. 1 May
Another hot day, we’re all tanning.

Figure F.11. Block 21 flooded, 1 April 1996
Thurs. 2 May

Warren, Messick, Schur, and Wolter finished work around lunchtime and headed to Lake Temescal for the farewell barbecue. The rest stuck around until mid-afternoon. Our last two features, the aforementioned well and privy, were deemed ineligible. So we got one eligible privy from Block 19 and zilch from Block 18-1. Hot again. The job is nearly done and Janet Pape and Jack Mc Ilroy are very relieved.

Fri. 3 May 1996

Final pack-up and clean-up. Stillman, Medin, and Makar finished packing gear to SSU. Coffin cleaned up the site office. I’ve been doing some figuring with Meyer. We averaged 18 days per city block, which should give us the world record for urban excavation. In England, we would take that much time just to get organized on a site. End of fieldwork.

Figure F.12. The Cypress core crew. Standing (l. to r.): Bill Stillman, Keith Warren, Janet Pape, Jack McIlroy, Mike Meyer, Conrad Praetzell, Nina Ilic. Middle row: Brian Mischke, Rick Wolter, Margo Schur, Anmarie Medin. Front row: Richelle Coffin, Pete Messick, Ginger Hellmann, Dave Makar, Mike Stoyka.
APPENDIX F

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS
OF SUMMARY FAUNAL DATA
Surprisingly, the occupation categories did not have as clear or consistent an effect as expected on meat species or cost. Wealthy professionals did consume relatively more high-cost cuts and fewer medium-cost cuts than did some others. Also surprisingly, archaeological features from unskilled households did not contain the most economical mix of cuts, but instead resembled the wealthy professionals’ assemblage more than the intermediate occupation categories.

Features from unskilled households had lower proportions of pork, which may have been progressively more common towards the higher-earning end of the category’s spectrum. This, too, is surprising, given that beef appears to have been the more prized meat, since hotels served more beef, and fewer low-cost cuts, than people ate at home.

Ethnicity affected species preference, but not the cost of cuts. Specifically, U.S.-born white contexts tended to have less beef, and Irish contexts tended to have more mutton.

Dwelling type was well correlated with meat-cut cost. In general, the higher-status the dwelling, the higher the percentage of expensive meat cuts, and the fewer medium- and low-cost cuts. The quality of one’s housing was a much better predictor of the quality of one’s diet than was one’s occupation or ethnicity. Species preferences, however, were not affected by dwelling type. People living in poorer housing expressed roughly the same preferences for meat species as did those in finer housing, but used cheaper cuts to do so.

Being an owner or a renter was irrelevant to meat consumption, except among residents of the intermediate-status Almost-polite houses, where renters ate more expensive cuts and fewer medium-cost and cheap cuts than did owners. In general, it appears that dietary choices were strongly related to one’s immediate standard of living, as expressed in the quality of one’s dwelling, rather than to one’s capital or underlying economic status, as measured by income or homeownership. There are probably modern parallels here.

People in the West of Market neighborhood tended to use more mutton and less beef than those in the other two neighborhoods. This may be due to a modestly higher representation of Irish families there, but that remains uncertain without further statistical testing. Households headed by women used higher proportions of mutton and lower proportions of pork. Since five of the six woman-headed households were Irish (an interesting pattern in itself), the preference for mutton probably owes more to the cultural background of the people than to the gender of the head of the household.
INTRODUCTION

This appendix describes results of a search for statistically significant patterning in the distribution of meat species (beef, mutton, and pork) and meat-cut cost categories (high, medium, and low) among Cypress Archaeological Project features divided according to potentially meaningful cultural categories. These categories include ethnicity (African American, German, Irish, U.S.-born white), occupation categories (Well-off professional, Professional, Skilled, Unskilled), tenancy (Owner, Tenant, Unknown tenant), neighborhood (East, West, Oakland Point), type of dwelling (from Two-story Victorian, or Polite Victorian house, through Informal workers cottage), private housing versus hotels, and woman-headed households versus others.

APPROACH AND METHODS

This analysis is based entirely on percentage data for each “analytical unit.” These analytical units are single or multiple stratigraphic units taken to represent a single sample of refuse from a single residential context, such as a house or a hotel. Each such context is represented by only one analytical unit, and each feature is taken to represent just one residential context, although this may be a simplification in one or more cases (e.g., Feature 2007). By analyzing the percentage composition of bone from each analytical unit, differences in the size of these features and their depositional history are eliminated from consideration. Only the mix of species and cut prices of the meat consumed is considered here; the amounts consumed are not evaluated.

The statistics used weight each feature equally. In effect, each analytical unit represents the mix of species and cut prices consumed by a single residential unit. This analysis is a comparison of the species and cut-price mixes of these residential units.

The analysis proceeded in steps, summarized below:

1. Select features suitable for the particular analysis.
2. Print a table showing the average species and cost percentages for each context category.
3. Check to see if any variable is significantly non-randomly distributed in the whole subsample.
4. Compare pairs of categories (i.e. Professional vs. Unskilled) to see if any variable (i.e., percentage of beef) is significantly different.
5. Do similar pairwise comparisons using lumped categories (i.e., Unskilled vs. all other occupation categories).
6. Interpret the results.

First, the features to be included in any given comparison were selected to include only those for which the relevant context data were available. Additional restrictions were also
applied in many cases, for example, limiting the cases to residential, as opposed to commercial, properties. For some analyses, features from rare types of contexts were excluded, such as the one Italian household in the ethnicity analysis, or the two Widow households in the occupation analysis.

Second, the data were summarized according to the context variables (such as African American, German, Irish, U.S.-born white) and reported in a table showing the mean percentages of species and meat-cut price categories. These values average the percentages of the features, so that small features count the same as large ones. They give a sense of the central tendencies of each context category. For example, one can note that features from African American contexts average a higher proportion of beef than do features from U.S.-born white contexts.

These tables of mean values are useful exploratory tools, but they are deceptively difficult to interpret. The mean values may hide a great deal of variation, and especially with the small sample sizes here, the differences they suggest may not be meaningful. How large must a difference be to be considered important? How close must two percentages be to be considered effectively the same? It is even possible for the means to be identical when there is actually a real difference between the categories. Consider a hypothetical case in which all the features from Latvian households had around 10% beef, while among the five Estonian households, four features had no beef and one had 100% beef, for an average of 20%. The mean values would suggest that Estonian households typically had a higher proportion of beef than did Latvian households, when in fact the opposite was true.

The next stages of the analysis attempt to resolve these problems by evaluating the statistical significance of the differences between categories of features. The statistics used are nonparametric, that is, they do not assume a normal (bell-shaped) distribution of values. This is important, since the small sample sizes mean that the luck of the draw is likely to produce non-normal sample distributions even if the underlaying patterns are normal. Moreover, humans are complicated, and there is no reason to assume normal distributions of behavior in such historically particular, individualistic matters as food preferences. Parametric tests, such as the familiar t-test, will often find “significant” differences between small samples of archaeological data simply because they are not normal and thus fit poorly to the t-test’s null hypothesis that both samples are drawn from a single normal distribution.

The statistics used here are the Wilcoxon rank-sum test (also called the Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon Test) for cases with two classes (such as a comparison of percent beef in Professional features vs. Unskilled features), and the equivalent test for more than two classes, the Kruskal-Wallis test. These are well explained in:

Gibbons, Jean D.  

In essence, these tests arrange all the values in rank order, from smallest to largest, disregarding the size of the differences between them. If the percentage of high-cost cuts was greater in Victorian houses than in cottages, the values from Victorian houses would mostly be towards
the high end of the list, and the values from cottages would mostly be towards the low end. If the percentage of high-cost cuts was the same in cottages and Victorians, then the values for each kind of house would be uniformly scattered through the whole list. The tests evaluate whether or not the list is significantly unbalanced, by calculating the odds of getting a pattern at least that unbalanced if you were to put the values in order by chance, such as by randomly drawing “Victorian” or “Cottage” from a collection of slips of paper with the appropriate number of each type. If the chance of getting a list as unevenly distributed as the observed one is low (less than 10%, or less than 5%), then the pattern is deemed to be significant, that is, probably due not to chance, but to a real difference between the two categories.

The third step applies only to analyses involving more than two categories, such as the occupation analysis. In these cases, the Kruskal-Wallis test is applied to each of the meat variables to determine if its distribution among all the categories is significantly different from random. A significant result indicates that there is significant patterning to be explained, but does not indicate what the pattern is.

The fourth step applies to all cases. Here, the Wilcoxon rank-sum test is used to compare pairs of categories, such as Victorian houses vs. Informal workers cottages. These results are easy to interpret: a significant result means that the variable (such as percent mutton) is significantly different in the two categories. Significantly different means that the difference is consistent enough that it is unlikely to be random, so it is appropriate to look for a cultural explanation. A difference with a probability of 5% has only a 5% chance of having occurred randomly, so we can consider it probably the result of some systematic process, rather than the luck of the draw. A significant result does not mean that the difference is large. A real, significant difference might nevertheless be subtle and not very important. Consider the difficulty of interpreting a finding that Latvian households consistently ate 1% more beef than Estonian ones. Significant differences indicate trends in the data that should be taken seriously, probably by examining and plotting the feature values. The pattern that appears is probably due to a real process, but the interpretation is up to the archaeologist.

The fifth step repeats the fourth, but using lumped categories such as features from Polite Victorian houses vs. all others.

The sixth and final step is statistical interpretation, in which the results are subjectively evaluated to see if they make any sort of coherent sense. I have done this in part by ordering the tables of significance tests so as to juxtapose comparisons that seem to be related, allowing me to abstract some generalizations from them. Others might notice and emphasize different patterns in the results. It is also important to look for multiple tests that confirm related trends. This is because the method used here is inductive. That is, I did not start with a hypothesis and test the data to evaluate it. Instead, I ran all the reasonable comparisons I could think of, and pulled out for discussion those that proved significant either at the 10% level (less than 10% chance that the two categories actually have identical distributions of values, that is, less than 10% chance that the difference is an illusion caused by the luck of the draw) or at the more convincing 5% level (less than 5% chance that the differences are an illusion caused by the luck of the draw). This procedure is likely to produce some spurious “significant” results by chance. That is, out of one hundred tests of two identical distributions of values, five are expected to show differences “significant” at the 5% level, just by chance. For this reason, isolated
significant results may or may not reflect real cultural processes. Where multiple significant results seem to reflect a single underlying trend, then the trend can be considered real.

Finally, the lack of statistically significant differences between most of the categories does not mean that there necessarily are no differences between the categories. It simply means that any differences present are not great enough to be detected with confidence based on the given sample size and variability.

The statistics were run on SAS software, using SAS instructions in the program MEAT4.SAS, faunal data from MEATSUM3.DBF, and context data from CYPCTX3.DBF. The program is a simple text file that can be viewed using any word processor, and the data files can be viewed directly by Excel or most database programs.

RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Category</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>Percent Beef</th>
<th>Percent Mutton</th>
<th>Percent Pork</th>
<th>Percent Meat-cut Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total/Mean:</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons:

All 4 categories together for non-randomness

All pairs:

- Wealthy (P+) vs. all others (P,S,U)
- Wealthy (P+) vs. Middle (P,S)
- Middle (P,S) vs. Unskilled (U)
- Middle (P,S) vs. Extremes (U,P+)
- Upper (P+,P) vs. Lower (S, U)
- Any skill (P+,P,S) vs. Unskilled (U)
**Significant Differences (comparisons that reached at least 10% significance):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Category</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Which has more?</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Sig @ 5%</th>
<th>Sig @ 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P+ vs. S</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>P+</td>
<td>0.0924</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P+ vs. Middle (S,P)</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>P+</td>
<td>0.0867</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All categories (S,U,P,P+)</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>0.0388</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P+ vs. P</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.0346</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P+ vs. S</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0.0576</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P+ vs. Others (U,S,P)</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>others</td>
<td>0.0452</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P+ vs. Middle (S,P)</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>middle</td>
<td>0.0373</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U vs. P</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.0498</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U vs. S</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0.0719</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U vs. P&amp;S</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>P&amp;S</td>
<td>0.0463</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U vs. All skilled (S, P, P+)</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>all skilled</td>
<td>0.0855</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;S vs. U&amp;P+</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>P&amp;S</td>
<td>0.0062</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;S vs. U&amp;P+</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>U&amp;P+</td>
<td>0.0656</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U vs. P</td>
<td>pork</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.0235</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U vs. P&amp;S</td>
<td>pork</td>
<td>P&amp;S</td>
<td>0.0903</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretations:**

The cost of meat cuts consumed in different households was related to the occupation category of the household, but not as clearly or consistently as might be expected. The one clear pattern is that members of wealthy professional (P+) households ate more expensive meat than did some others. Features from wealthy professional households had a higher proportion of high-cost meat cuts than those from either skilled workers’ households or skilled and professional workers’ homes combined. These wealthy professional households also had lower proportions of medium-cost cuts than did professional or skilled households, professional and skilled households lumped together, and those lumped with unskilled households. Oddly enough, there were no significant differences in the proportions of low-cost cuts.

Stranger yet, features from unskilled households did not have the most economical assortment of cuts. On the contrary, the percentage data suggest that they were similar to the wealthy professional households in having a relatively high proportion of high-cost cuts, although this pattern was not significant, and they had significantly lower proportions of medium-cost cuts than skilled, professional, skilled and professional, and even all other
professions lumped together. Lumping the paradoxically similar unskilled and wealthy professional households together, these two had more high-cost cuts and fewer medium-cost cuts than did the middle two occupation categories together.

That these patterns appear mostly in the medium-cost cuts, but not consistently in the high-cost cuts or at all in the low-cost ones, suggests that the effect of profession on meat-cut preferences was not simple or clear except for the evidently more lavish spending of the wealthy professionals. The apparent similarity of the extreme high- and low-income groups as opposed to the middle-income skilled and professional households is simply hard to understand. The confusing results by occupation categories may reflect the small numbers of features in the Wealthy Professional (3) and Unskilled (5) samples. With such small samples, real patterns must be very strong to show up as significant, and a few idiosyncratic cases can have a disproportionately misleading effect.

There may be a weak pattern in species preference. The percentage data suggest that pork becomes more common as one progresses from lower-status to higher-status occupation categories. This impression is supported by the significantly lower proportion of pork in unskilled households compared to professional households, and to professional and skilled households lumped together. This does not make obvious sense from an economic or a social-status standpoint.

### Ethnicity

**Common Ethnicities:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>Percent Beef</th>
<th>Percent Mutton</th>
<th>Percent Pork</th>
<th>Percent Meat-cut Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Am</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. born white</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total/Mean:</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All Ethnicities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity (all known)</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>Beef</th>
<th>Mutton</th>
<th>Pork</th>
<th>Percent Meat-cut Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-Am</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German/English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prussian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scots/Irish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.-born white</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total/Mean:</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons:

- All 4 common ethnicities together for non-randomness
- All pairs of common ethnicities
- Each of the 4 common ethnicities vs. all the others lumped together, including rare ones
- White from former British Empire (Canada, English/US, Irish, Scots, Scots/Irish, U.S.) vs. white from Continental Europe (German, Prussian, Italian)

Significant Differences (comparisons that reached at least 10% significance):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Which has more?</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Sig @ 5%</th>
<th>Sig @ 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.-born white vs. African Am</td>
<td>beef</td>
<td>African Am</td>
<td>0.0421</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.-born white vs. German</td>
<td>beef</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>0.0691</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish vs. all other, including rare</td>
<td>mutton</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>0.0678</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretations:

The significant differences by ethnicity are few, and seem to reflect culturally variable preferences for different meat species. Features from U.S.-born white residences have less beef than do those from German or African American homes. Irish households have higher percentages of mutton than all others together, not surprisingly. The cost of meat cuts does not seem to be significantly related to ethnicity.
## Dwelling Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Type</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>Percent Beef</th>
<th>Percent Mutton</th>
<th>Percent Pork</th>
<th>Percent Meat-cut Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (Polite Victorian House)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (Almost-polite House)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (Simple, 2-story)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (Duplex)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (Informal workers Cottage)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/C (Residence over shop)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H (Hotel)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Butcher shop)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA (Unknown)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total/Mean:</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Dwelling Types, lumped

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Types, lumped</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>Percent Beef</th>
<th>Percent Mutton</th>
<th>Percent Pork</th>
<th>Percent Meat-cut Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Victorian (I,D,S,A)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian (P)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total/Mean:</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nice (P,A)                      | 21                 | 54   | 33     | 13    | 39   | 36     | 25    |
Simple (I,D,S)                  | 39                 | 51   | 36     | 13    | 29   | 42     | 29    |
**Total/Mean:**                 | **60**             | **52**| **35**| **13**| **32**| **40**| **28**|

Cottage (I)                     | 33                 | 50   | 36     | 14    | 29   | 41     | 30    |
House (P,A,S,D)                 | 27                 | 54   | 34     | 12    | 37   | 39     | 24    |
**Total/Mean:**                 | **60**             | **52**| **35**| **13**| **32**| **40**| **28**|

Dwelling (P,A,S,D,I)            | 62                 | 52   | 35     | 13    | 32   | 40     | 28    |
Hotel                           | 4                  | 64   | 28     | 8     | 38   | 45     | 17    |
**Total/Mean:**                 | **66**             | **53**| **35**| **13**| **33**| **40**| **27**|
Comparisons:

All 9 categories together for non-randomness, various subsets excluding non-residential, all commercial, etc.

All pairs:

Polite Victorian (P) vs. other homes (A,S,D,I)
Nice homes (P,A) vs. simple homes (S,D,I)
Cottages (I) vs. other homes (P,A,S,D)
Hotel vs. other dwellings except Butcher shop and Residence over shop

Significant Differences (comparisons that reached at least 10% significance):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling types:</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Which has more?</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Sig @ 5%</th>
<th>Sig @ 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Dwelling types</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0.0715</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Dwelling except butchershop</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0.0670</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Dwelling except butchershop</td>
<td>beef</td>
<td>0.0670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel vs. P</td>
<td>mutton</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.0726</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel vs. A</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.0797</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel vs. P</td>
<td>beef</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>0.0467</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel vs. P</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>0.0726</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel vs. I</td>
<td>beef</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>0.0177</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel vs. I</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.0177</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel vs. Dwelling (P,A,S,D,I)</td>
<td>beef</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>0.0581</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel vs. Dwelling (P,A,S,D,I)</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>0.0326</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P vs. D</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.0726</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A vs. S</td>
<td>mutton</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0.0679</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I vs. A</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.0430</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I vs. P</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.0094</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I vs. P</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.0407</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I vs. S</td>
<td>beef</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.0949</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I vs. D</td>
<td>pork</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.0962</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vict (P) vs. NonVict (A,S,D,I)</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>Vict</td>
<td>0.0322</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice (P,A) vs. Simple (S,D,I)</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>Nice</td>
<td>0.0042</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice (P,A) vs. Simple (S,D,I)</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>0.0227</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice (P,A) vs. Simple (S,D,I)</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>0.0957</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House (P,A,S,D) vs. Cottage (I)</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>0.0139</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House (P,A,S,D) vs. Cottage (I)</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>0.0167</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpretations:

Unlike profession and ethnicity, dwelling types do have clear, easily intelligible, and expected patterning in meat cut prices. The quality of one’s housing was a much better predictor of the quality of one’s diet than was one’s profession or ethnicity.

The overall analyses indicate that the percentages of beef and low-priced cuts are significantly non-randomly distributed among different dwelling types. More detail emerges from the pairwise comparisons.

First, hotels clearly differ from other residences. They have significantly higher percentages of beef than do two of the other individual dwelling types and than other dwellings in general. The mean percentages table suggests that hotels also have lower percentages of low-cost cuts than any other dwelling type, but this proves to be significant only in comparison to Almost-polite houses and Informal workers cottages. These two dwelling types are the most numerous in the sample, which probably explains why this pattern appears significant only near both ends of the socioeconomic spectrum. It may well be true across the board, but is just not strong enough to be detected in the comparisons with smaller sample sizes. Given that there are statistically significant differences between hotels and other dwellings on beef and low-cost cuts, plus a few other scattered differences, it is reasonable to take seriously the other differences in hotel meat preferences shown in the percentage table, even though they are not statistically significant. When eating at hotels, people seem to have consumed different meats (more beef, less mutton and pork), and better cuts (especially avoiding the low-cost ones) than they did at home.

Among non-commercial dwellings, there is a consistent trend towards more expensive meats as one progresses from the least to the most prestigious homes. Two-story Victorian homes have significantly more high-cost meat than not only Informal workers cottages, but also than all others lumped together. The top two dwelling types lumped together have more high-cost cuts, and fewer medium and low-cost cuts, than the three lower-status dwelling types lumped together. Informal workers cottages have significantly more low-cost cuts and fewer high-cost cuts than do all the other dwellings lumped together. By a number of measures, then, quality of housing corresponds directly to cost of meat consumed.

The high proportion of beef at hotels, where the cuts were generally more expensive than in homes, would seem to indicate that beef was prized relative to mutton and pork. Yet in homes, while the cost of cuts clearly parallels the quality of the housing, there is no comparable gradation in meat species. The only real hint of it is in the percentage tables, where the “nice” houses (the top two categories) have a higher average percentage of beef than do the three poorer categories—but this pattern did not prove significant. In fact, the humble worker’s cottages have significantly more beef than do the three simple two-story houses. The conservative interpretation of this inconsistent patterning is that there really is not a great difference in species by dwelling type. This suggests that poorer people expressed roughly the same preferences for meat species as did wealthier ones, but used cheaper cuts as a means to do so. It might have been preferable to economize subtly in degree, by choosing cheaper cuts, than to economize unequivocally in kind, by eating less beef and more mutton and pork. A more detailed analysis of species and cuts by dwelling type or some related classification might confirm or reject this impression, or offer other interesting insights.
## Tenancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Type</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>Percent Beef</th>
<th>Percent Mutton</th>
<th>Percent Pork</th>
<th>Percent Meat-cut Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O (Owner)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/T (Owner/tenant)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T (Tenant)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U (Unknown/transient)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The table excludes commercial properties and a residence over a shop.)

**Comparisons:**

- All 4 categories together for non-randomness
- All pairs:
  - Owner (O) vs. Renter (T,U)
  - Owner (O) vs. Renter (T,U) within just a single dwelling type: Polite Victorian House, Almost-polite House, or Informal Workers Cottage

**Significant differences:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Status</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Which has more?</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Sig @ 5%</th>
<th>Sig @ 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner vs. Renter, Cottages</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Renter</td>
<td>0.0549</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner vs. Renter, Almost-polite</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Renter</td>
<td>0.0109</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner vs. Renter, Almost-polite</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0370</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner vs. Renter, Almost-polite</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0760</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretations:**

Being an owner or a renter did not have an obvious relationship to meat consumption. Across the entire sample, there was no significant difference between owners and renters. Thinking that differences between owners and renters might be made clearer by restricting the analysis to a single kind of dwelling, I also compared owners versus renters within each of the three types of dwellings with sufficient numbers of features for analysis. Among features from Victorian houses, there was no significant difference between owners and renters. Among features from worker’s cottages, the only significant difference was in the proportion of medium-cost cuts, a pattern that is hard to assign much meaning to. There was a consistent, significant difference, however, between owners and renters of Almost-polite houses. The renters ate more high-cost cuts and fewer medium- and low-cost cuts than the owners. This contradicts the assumption that owners were better off than renters. In this one category of dwelling, renters seem to have lived better than owners. One could speculate about the pressures of house payments and maintenance on established owners, versus the disposable...
income of families with rising fortunes who could afford to rent a nice house but had not yet purchased one. However, the fact that this pattern does not repeat in either the lower-status worker’s cottages or the higher-status Victorians makes such interpretations tenuous.

The lack of a significant difference overall between owners and renters, and the inconsistent patterning within specific dwelling types comes as a bit of a surprise, since the quality of one’s housing was such a good predictor of meat-cut costs. Diet seems to be related to one’s immediate standard of living, rather than one’s capital or underlying economic status.

### NEIGHBORHOOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>Percent Beef</th>
<th>Percent Mutton</th>
<th>Percent Pork</th>
<th>Percent Meat-cut Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Market</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Point</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Market</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total/Mean:</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons:

All 3 categories together for non-randomness

All pairs:

**Significant Differences (comparisons that reached at least 10% significance):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhoods</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Which has more?</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Sig @ 5%</th>
<th>Sig @ 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Neighborhoods</td>
<td>mutton</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0081</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E vs. W (type=R only)</td>
<td>beef</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.0427</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E vs. W (type=R only)</td>
<td>mutton</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O vs. W (type=R only)</td>
<td>mutton</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>0.0149</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretations:**

There is clear patterning in species preference by neighborhood, but no significant patterning in cut costs.

The clearest pattern is in mutton, which has a significantly non-random distribution among the three neighborhoods. The West of Market neighborhood has significantly higher percentages of mutton than either the East of Market or the Oakland Point neighborhoods. The West of Market neighborhood had a correspondingly lower percentage of beef than the other two, although the pattern is significant only in comparison with the East of Market neighborhood. It seems that people in the West of Market neighborhood were substituting mutton for beef, relative to the others.
While it is tempting to suspect that the West of Market neighborhood may have been an Irish district, accounting for the greater prevalence of mutton, the reality is not so clear. The West of Market sample with faunal data does have a higher percentage of Irish properties (35%) than the East of Market (26%) or Oakland Point (17%) neighborhoods. These differences, while of the correct nature to explain the neighborhood species patterning, are not obviously large enough to do so. Additional statistical testing might be able to resolve whether the neighborhood patterns simply reflect ethnic group preferences, or have some other causes.

Interestingly, there is no parallel pattern in cut costs. Although the percentages suggest that the Oakland Point neighborhood had generally less-expensive cuts, the pattern is not significant. In any case, it is not Oakland Point but the West of Market neighborhood that stands out as different in species preference. It appears to be intermediate, not extreme, in cut costs. This all suggests that the neighborhood differences are more of preferences than economics. This is another area that might reward additional investigation, not only statistical analysis but also consideration of the possible differences between the neighborhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Head of Household Gender</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>Percent Beef</th>
<th>Percent Mutton</th>
<th>Percent Pork</th>
<th>Percent Meat-cut Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Noncommercial:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not woman-headed</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woman-headed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cottages Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not woman-headed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woman-headed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total/Mean:</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irish Only:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not woman–headed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woman–headed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total/Mean:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparisons:

All pairs, limited as shown

Significant Differences (comparisons that reached at least 10% significance):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head of Household Gender:</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Which has more?</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Sig @ 5%</th>
<th>Sig @ 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-woman vs. Woman</td>
<td>mutton</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>0.0406</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(type=R only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-woman vs. Woman</td>
<td>mutton</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>0.0850</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cottages only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-woman vs. Woman</td>
<td>pork</td>
<td>Non-woman</td>
<td>0.0969</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cottages only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-woman vs. Woman</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>Non-woman</td>
<td>0.0064</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cottages only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretations:

The context data indicated that some households were headed by women, but did not show that the others were definitely headed by men, as opposed to being unknown or assumed. For this reason, I used the clumsy woman/non-woman distinction.

Five of the six woman-headed households were Irish (a pattern that is interesting in itself), and three of the six lived in worker’s cottages. Since the small number of woman-headed households was so concentrated in certain subsets of the sample, I analyzed the woman-headed households in comparison not only to all the other residences, but also in comparison to just the other Irish households, and just the other worker’s cottages. The idea was to separate the effect of the head of household’s gender from that of ethnicity or dwelling type.

The patterns are not easy to interpret. Woman-headed households seem to have had significantly more mutton and less pork than did non-woman headed households. This might be due to the woman-headed households being Irish, and the Irish generally having more mutton. Of course, the apparent Irish preference for mutton might equally well result from the unusual number of woman-headed households in the Irish sample. A regional Irish taste for mutton, however, seems more historically plausible. This could probably be resolved with additional statistical scrutiny of the data.
APPENDIX G

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF BOTTLE DATA BY GENERAL CATEGORIES
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Unskilled workers left a lower proportion of whole bottles in their glass refuse recovered on the Cypress Archaeological Project than did people of other professions, suggesting that they recycled bottles more than did better-paid workers. Ethnicity had no significant effect on recycling. Residents of Polite two-story Victorian homes may have recycled less than did residents of Informal workers’ cottages, and possibly less than did residents of all other types of dwellings. Features from the West of Market neighborhood (Blocks 4-6) suggest less recycling than do those from other neighborhoods. This pattern cannot be explained by the distribution of professions among neighborhoods, but it might be due to the concentration of Polite two-story Victorian homes on blocks 4 through 6.

Alcoholic beverage bottles were present in all but two of the features analyzed, comprising about 19% of the total bottle MNI. Overall, wine and champagne bottles were the most common, at a bit under 5% of total bottle MNI, with beer and ale bottles a bit over 4%. Liquor bottles were scarcer, at under 1% of total bottle MNI.

Wine bottles were strongly correlated to better-paying professions, being most common in wealthy professionals’ refuse, and becoming progressively scarcer in features from professional, skilled, and unskilled households. Conversely, but less strongly indicated, beer and/or ale bottles comprised a greater fraction of the alcoholic beverage bottles at households of skilled workers than at homes of wealthy professionals, and liquor bottles comprised more of the alcoholic beverage bottles in lower-income (skilled and unskilled) households than in higher-income (professional and wealthy professional) households. Wine bottles may have been more common in households headed by women. Liquor bottles were completely absent from Polite two-story Victorian household refuse, in significant and consistent contrast with most other dwelling types. The residents of these finest houses seem to have avoided not alcohol in general, but hard liquor specifically—at least at home. This finding, together with the greater prevalence of liquor bottles at households of lower-paid workers, suggests that hard liquor may have been associated with the lower class. Of the alcohol that they did consume, the residents of Polite two-story Victorian houses emphasized wine more than did residents of duplexes, Informal workers’ cottages, or all other dwelling types combined.

Homeowners may have disposed of more alcoholic beverage bottles in general, more wine bottles, and—among residents of Informal workers’ cottages—more liquor bottles than did renters. This consistent correlation of homeownership with higher alcohol consumption is a surprising reversal from ownership’s lack of effect on meat purchases. Archaeological features of unknown tenancy status, presumably mostly representing short-term renters, had more alcoholic beverage bottles than did those of more stable renters, and among the alcohol bottles, a lower proportion of ale and/or beer. That is, long-term renters seem to have consumed less
alcohol than did either short-term renters or owners, and short-term renters seem to have consumed both more alcohol and less of the least-intoxicating variety than did more stable renters.

Strongly associated with higher-paid employment, finer housing, and home ownership, wine and champagne bottles appear to be an excellent index of what would generally be recognized as upper-class status. Since wine and champagne bottles are associated with these three disparate variables, it is possible that the proportion of these bottles among all alcoholic beverage bottles might prove to be a better index of overall social status than any one of the professional, residential, or tenancy variables alone.

Irish households may have disposed of more liquor bottles than did others, especially than U.S.-born white households. German households differed from others in having more food storage glassware than others, especially than U.S.-born households, more grooming and health bottles than others, and fewer writing-ink bottles than others.

Grooming and health bottles may be more common at unskilled and skilled workers’ homes, and less common at professionals’ and wealthy professionals’ homes. Comprising about 25% of the total bottle MNI, this is a broad category that ranges from medicines to luxury cosmetics, so interpretation is difficult.

Residents of the three Simple, two-story houses probably purchased more food in glass containers than did others, and residents of the four Duplexes seem to have used more writing ink than did others. With samples this small, however, the explanation for these real but tiny patterns may reduce to peculiarities of just a few individuals.

Residents of the Oakland Point neighborhood (Blocks 19-37) differed from residents of the other two neighborhoods in discarding more commercial food bottles, and more bottles in which food had been locally preserved, either in their own homes or in local household production by others. Since Oakland Point had the lowest proportion of professional and wealthy professional households and the highest proportion of the lower-paid skilled and unskilled workers, these preferences for food purchased or preserved in glass might have an economic basis. Oakland Point residents also had fewer wine bottles as a proportion of their alcoholic-beverage-bottle refuse than did either of the other two neighborhoods, presumably due to the low proportion of households with better-paying jobs that were associated with wine consumption.

The glass data are rich and complex, and this analysis is only a first step. Future analyses of more narrowly defined categories might clarify or help to explain some of the patterns noted here, and discover others.
This report describes results of a search for statistically significant patterning in the distribution of general categories of whole and broken glass bottles among features divided according to potentially meaningful cultural categories. The bottle categories analyzed are summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Variable name</th>
<th>Category includes/rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole bottles</td>
<td>whole</td>
<td>A reverse index of recycling. The lower the percentage of whole bottles, the more recycling is implied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>food</td>
<td>Commercial food bottles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food storage</td>
<td>foodst</td>
<td>Bottles in which food was stored at the household level, such as canning jars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grooming/Health</td>
<td>groom</td>
<td>A wide range of hygiene, medicinal, and cosmetic products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol in general</td>
<td>alcohol</td>
<td>All alcoholic beverage bottles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer and Ale</td>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>Beer, Ale, and Ale/Beer bottles. Other potentially similar beverages are not included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine and Champagne</td>
<td>wine</td>
<td>Wine, Champagne, and Wine/Champagne bottles. Other potentially similar beverages are not included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor</td>
<td>liquor</td>
<td>Whiskey, Bourbon, Gin, and Schnapps bottles. Other possibly similar beverages and bottles, such as brandy and flasks, are not included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>writing</td>
<td>Ink bottles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cultural categories are the same as those used in the analysis of faunal remains (Appendix G). They are summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Category includes/rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>African American, German, Irish, and U.S.-born white for most analyses. Additional less common ethnicities are included when comparing each of the above with “all others.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation category</td>
<td>Well-off professional, Professional, Skilled, Unskilled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenancy status</td>
<td>Owner, Tenant, Unknown (presumably short-term tenants in most cases). Tenant and Unknown are lumped in some analyses as Nonowners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>East of Market Street (Blocks 1-3), West of Market Street (Blocks 4-6), Oakland Point (Blocks 19-37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling type</td>
<td>Polite two-story Victorian, Almost polite, Simple two-story, Duplex, Residence over shop (excluded from many analyses), Informal workers’ cottage, Butcher shop (excluded from most analyses), and Hotel (excluded from many analyses). Some analyses lump all private housing versus hotels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman-headed household</td>
<td>Households identified as woman-headed, versus ones not so identified and presumed to be not headed by women.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This analysis follows the same methodology as the faunal analysis, and tests all the same contrasts of cultural categories. The principal difference is the nature of the variables that describe the glass. This analysis, like the faunal analysis, uses percentage data in order to look at the composition of each feature’s assemblage, without considering the relative amounts of glass from each context. The assumption in using percentage data in this way is that households consumed relatively similar amounts products sold in bottle glass all told (or meat, in the faunal analysis), so comparing the proportions of specific types of bottle glass relative to the total amount recovered should bring out differences in consumption that would otherwise be masked by culturally unimportant differences in the size and artifact density of features excavated. However, while the faunal analysis was based simply on percentage data for each “analytical unit” (e.g., “15% of all identifiable bone from Feature X was beef”), the glass data are slightly more complex because of the troublesome tendency of bottles to exist in two drastically different states: intact, or broken into a large number of pieces. Most artifacts, such as bone, have a more limited and continuous gradation of degrees of breakage. Since one intact bottle was functionally equivalent to a large number of fragments of a similar bottle, characterizing a sample that contains both whole and broken bottles is not straightforward. In order to approach this problem, I created three different measures of each category of bottles to be analyzed. Each has its advantages and disadvantages. I ran the same statistical tests on all of them, and I consider all of them in interpreting the results.

First and simplest, I used counts in which each glass object, whether a whole bottle or a fragment, counts as a single item. In this approach, wine bottles, for example, are quantified as the total number of whole wine bottles and fragments of wine bottles, divided by the total of all bottle glass items (whole and fragments) in the feature. This approach has the virtue of simplicity, and it takes into account the entire assemblage, regardless of its degree of breakage. On the other hand, it underrepresents any kind of bottle that is unusually prone to be found intact, since these are more often counted as a single item, equivalent to each of the many fragments of a bottle that is broken. It can also create the appearance of differences between originally identical glass assemblages that have been subjected to differing degrees of breakage for pre- or post-depositional reasons. Stronger bottles, which will tend to be intact in protected deposits, will appear to be rare in those deposits, while they will appear to be more numerous in assemblages in which they have been broken. Such differences have no simple relationship to the use of the bottles before discard, which is presumably what the analysis would ideally assess. Finally, this approach will produce skewed results if some households recycled whole bottles more than did other households. I identified these “percentage of items” variables with a terminal I (for Items), as in Winel. Second, I avoided some of these problems by excluding whole bottles, and working only with fragments. Wine bottles, for example, are quantified simply as the number of fragments of wine bottles, divided by the total number of fragments in the feature, ignoring any whole bottles. This approach should largely eliminate biases due to differential recycling. However, it only partially escapes the breakage problem, since in protected assemblages the whole bottles are not included, while in more broken-up ones, the same bottles have become fragments and are included. In practice, since most of the items
recovered were fragments, this measure usually did not differ much from the previous one. Patterns that were significant in “percentage of items” were usually also significant in “percentage of fragments,” and vice versa. I identified these “percentage of fragments” variables with a terminal F (for Frags), as in WineF.

In the one case of measuring whole bottles as a category, I had to vary the “percentage of total fragments” approach. Whole bottles obviously cannot be excluded from an analysis of whole bottles. In this case, I divided the number of whole bottles by the number of fragments. This is a reasonable index of frequency of whole bottles, but is not strictly speaking a percentage, because the whole bottles are not included in the denominator. In an assemblage with many whole bottles and few fragments, this value could exceed 100%.

Finally, I used the MNI (minimum number of individual bottles) as given in the supplied data. In this approach, wine bottles were quantified as the MNI of wine bottles divided by the total MNI of bottles in the feature. This approach largely escapes the breakage problem, since in theory with a complete sample, a broken bottle would contribute exactly the same single individual to the MNI total as a whole one would. When not all fragments of every bottle are recovered, however, MNI probably underrepresents those bottles that tend to break more readily or into smaller pieces, or that have fewer individually diagnostic parts than others. That is, a collection containing some pieces of three broken bottles of the same type could well have no duplicates of diagnostic parts, producing an MNI of 1. For this reason, MNI tends to compress the variability in frequency of bottles by understating the number of multiple examples, and this effect will not be equal for bottles with different characteristics and tendencies to break. Nevertheless, the MNI approach is probably the best available approximation of the original bottle assemblage in use, and the errors it introduces are probably generally such that they reduce the differences between assemblages, rather than introducing spurious ones. That is, percentage of MNI is a relatively robust, conservative, but potentially less-sensitive measure than the other two. I identified these “percentage of MNI” variables with a terminal M (for MNI), as in WineM.

In order to better capture the variation in alcohol consumption, I also created variables in which the number of items, fragments, or MNI of wine/champagne bottles, ale/beer bottles, and liquor bottles was divided by the total items, fragments, or MNI of all alcoholic-beverage bottles. These measures should reflect preferences in types of alcohol without being obscured by variations in use of other glass containers or variations in total alcoholic-beverage consumption. A large amount of glass was identified as “alcoholic-beverage bottle” with no further detail. These bottles cannot be counted in the wine, beer, or liquor categories, but instead form an “unknown type of alcoholic beverage” category that I did not analyze separately. For this reason, the three identified categories do not sum to 100%. I identified these “percentage of alcoholic-beverage bottle” measures as winealci, winealcf, and winealcm; beeralci, beeralcf, and beeralcm; and liqalci, liqalcf, and liqalcm. In order to save space, I do not report these values in the percentage data tables, but only in the significance-test tables. The percentage data can be estimated (but not calculated exactly) from the data that I do report. For example, winealci can be estimated by dividing winei by alcholi.

My approach is to analyze all the measures of each category of interest, since no one of them is ideal. The MNI variables, as the most conservative, should carry the most weight in
interpretations. When all three measures of the same category are found to have significant patterning, the pattern seems more strongly supported. When only one or both of the non-MNI variables are significantly patterned, the pattern may be due to one or more of the confounding factors discussed above, or it may be real, but not strong enough to overcome the damping-out quality of the MNI measure.

**Complete list of bottle variables analyzed:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variablename</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wholei</td>
<td>Whole bottles / total items (whole + frags)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wholf</td>
<td>Whole bottles / total fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whom</td>
<td>Whole bottles / total MNI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foodi</td>
<td>Food-bottles (whole + frags) / total items (whole + frags)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foodf</td>
<td>Food-bottle fragments / total fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foodm</td>
<td>Food-bottle MNI / total MNI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foodsti</td>
<td>Food-storage bottles (whole + frags) / total items (whole + frags)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foodstf</td>
<td>Food-storage bottle fragments / total fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foodstm</td>
<td>Food-storage bottle MNI / total MNI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groomi</td>
<td>Grooming/health bottles (whole + frags) / total items (whole + frags)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groomf</td>
<td>Grooming/health bottle fragments / total fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groomm</td>
<td>Grooming/health bottle MNI / total MNI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writingi</td>
<td>Writing-ink bottles (whole + frags) / total items (whole + frags)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writingf</td>
<td>Writing-ink bottle fragments / total fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writingm</td>
<td>Writing-ink bottle MNI / total MNI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alcoholi</td>
<td>Alcoholic-beverage bottles (whole + frags) / total items (whole + frags)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alcoholf</td>
<td>Alcoholic-beverage bottle fragments / total fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alcoholm</td>
<td>Alcoholic-beverage bottle MNI / total MNI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beeri</td>
<td>Beer and/or ale bottles (whole + frags) / total items (whole + frags)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beeref</td>
<td>Beer and/or ale bottle fragments / total fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beerm</td>
<td>Beer and/or ale bottle MNI / total MNI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>winei</td>
<td>Wine and/or champagne bottles (whole + frags) / total items (whole + frags)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>winef</td>
<td>Wine and/or champagne bottle fragments / total fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>winem</td>
<td>Wine and/or champagne bottle MNI / total MNI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liquori</td>
<td>Hard liquor bottles (whole + frags) / total items (whole + frags)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liquorf</td>
<td>Hard liquor bottle fragments / total fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liquorm</td>
<td>Hard liquor bottle MNI / total MNI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The rest of the methodology is essentially the same as that used in the faunal analysis (Appendix G). The methodology discussion from the faunal report is reproduced below with minor changes to correspond to the bottle analysis.

This analysis is based entirely on percentage data for each “analytical unit.” These “analytical units” are single or multiple stratigraphic units taken to represent a single sample of refuse from a single residential context, such as a house or a hotel. Each such context is represented by only one analytical unit, and each is taken to represent just one residential context, although this may be a simplification in one or more cases (e.g., Feature 2007). By analyzing the percentage composition of bottle glass from each analytical unit, differences in the size of these feature or feature clusters and their depositional history are eliminated from consideration. Only the mix of bottle types is considered here; the amounts discarded are not evaluated.

The statistics used weight each feature equally. In effect, each analytical unit represents the mix of bottle types discarded by a single residential unit. This analysis is a comparison of the bottle-type mixes of these residential units.

The analysis proceeded in steps, summarized below:

1. Select features suitable for the particular analysis
2. Print a table showing the average bottle-type percentages (by items, fragments, and MNI) for each category. To save space, only types with significant patterning or other findings of interest are reported here.
3. Check to see if any variable is significantly nonrandomly distributed in the whole subsample.
4. Compare pairs of categories (i.e., Professional vs. Unskilled) to see if any variable (i.e., percentage of wine bottles) is significantly different.
5. Do similar pairwise comparisons using lumped categories (i.e., Unskilled vs. all other occupation categories).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variablename</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>beeralci</td>
<td>Beer and/or ale bottles (whole+frags) / alcoholic beverage bottles (whole+frags)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beeralcf</td>
<td>Beer and/or ale bottle fragments / alcoholic beverage bottle fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beeralcm</td>
<td>Beer and/or ale bottle MNI / alcoholic beverage bottle MNI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>winealci</td>
<td>Wine and/or champagne bottles (whole+frags) / alc. bev. bottles (whole+frags)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>winealcf</td>
<td>Wine and/or champagne bottle fragments / alcoholic beverage bottle fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>winealcm</td>
<td>Wine and/or champagne bottle MNI / alcoholic beverage bottle MNI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liqalci</td>
<td>Hard liquor bottles (whole + frags) alcoholic beverage bottles (whole+frags)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liqalcf</td>
<td>Hard liquor bottle fragments alcoholic beverage bottle fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liqalcm</td>
<td>Hard liquor bottle MNI / alcoholic beverage bottle MNI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Interpret the results.

First, the features to be included in any given comparison were selected to include only those for which the relevant context data were available. Additional restrictions were also applied in many cases, for example limiting the cases to residential, as opposed to commercial, properties. For some analyses, features from rare types of contexts were excluded, such as the one Italian household in most of the ethnicity analyses, or the two Widow households in the occupation analysis.

Second, the data was summarized according to the context variables (such as African American, German, Irish, U.S.-born white) and reported in a table showing the mean percentages of variables. These values average the percentages of the features, so small features count the same as large ones. They give a sense of the central tendencies of each context category. For example, one can note that features from hotel contexts average a higher proportion of liquor bottles than do features from Polite two-story Victorian houses.

These tables of mean values are useful exploratory tools, but they are deceptively difficult to interpret. The mean values may hide a great deal of variation, and especially with the small sample sizes here, the differences they suggest may not be meaningful. How large must a difference be to be considered important? How close must two percentages be to be considered effectively the same? It is even possible for the means to be identical when there is actually a real difference between the categories. Consider a hypothetical case in which all the features from Latvian households had around 10% wine bottles, while among the five Estonian households, four features had no wine bottles and one had 100% wine bottles, for an average of 20%. The mean values would suggest that Estonian households typically had a higher proportion of wine bottles than did Latvian households, when in fact the opposite was true.

The next stages of the analysis attempt to resolve these problems by evaluating the statistical significance of the differences between categories of features. The statistics used are nonparametric, that is, they do not assume a normal (bell-shaped) distribution of values. This is important, since the small sample sizes mean that the luck of the draw is likely to produce non-normal sample distributions even if the underlaying patterns are normal. Moreover, humans are complicated, and there is no reason to assume normal distributions of behavior in such historically particular, individualistic matters as food preferences. Parametric tests, such as the familiar t-test, will often find “significant” differences between small samples of archaeological data simply because they are not normal and thus fit poorly to the t-test’s null hypothesis that both samples are drawn from a single normal distribution.

The statistics used here are the Wilcoxon rank-sum test (also called the Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon Test) for cases with two classes (such as a comparison of percent wine bottles in Professional features vs. Unskilled features), and the equivalent test for more than two classes, the Kruskal-Wallis test. These are well explained in:
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In essence, these tests arrange all the values in rank order, from smallest to largest, disregarding the size of the differences between them. If the percentage of wine bottles was greater in Victorian houses than in cottages, the values from Victorian houses would mostly be towards the high end of the list, and the values from cottages would mostly be towards the low end. If the percentage of wine bottles was the same in cottages and Victorians, then the values for each kind of house would be uniformly scattered through the whole list. The tests evaluate whether or not the list is significantly unbalanced, by calculating the odds of getting a pattern at least that unbalanced if you were to put the values in order by chance, such as by randomly drawing “Victorian” or “Cottage” from a collection of slips of paper with the appropriate number of each type. If the chance of getting a list as unevenly distributed as the observed one is low (less than 10%, or less than 5%), then the pattern is deemed to be significant, that is, probably due not to chance, but to a real difference between the two categories.

The third step applies only to analyses involving more than two categories, such as the occupation analysis. In these cases, the Kruskal-Wallis test is applied to each of the bottle variables to determine if its distribution among all the categories is significantly different from random. A significant result indicates that there is significant patterning to be explained, but does not indicate what the pattern is.

The fourth step applies to all cases. Here, the Wilcoxon rank-sum test is used to compare pairs of categories, such as Polite Victorian houses vs. Informal workers’ cottages. These results are easy to interpret: a significant result means that the variable (such as percent of wine bottles) is significantly different in the two categories. Significantly different means that the difference is consistent enough that it is unlikely to be random, so it is appropriate to look for a cultural explanation. A difference with a probability of 5% has only a 5% chance of having occurred randomly, so we can consider it probably the result of some systematic process, rather than the luck of the draw. A significant result does not mean that the difference is large. A real, significant difference might nevertheless be subtle and not very important. Consider the difficulty of interpreting a finding that Latvian households consistently discarded 1% more wine bottles than Estonian ones. Significant differences indicate trends in the data that should be taken seriously, probably by examining and plotting the feature values. The pattern that appears is probably due to a real process, but the interpretation is up to the archaeologist.

The fifth step repeats the fourth, but using lumped categories such as features from Polite Victorian houses vs. all others.

The sixth and final step is statistical interpretation, in which the results are subjectively evaluated to see if they make any sort of coherent sense. I have done this in part by ordering the tables of significance tests so as to juxtapose comparisons that seem to be related, allowing me to abstract some generalizations from them. Others might notice and emphasize different patterns in the results. It is also important to look for multiple tests that confirm related trends. This is because the method used here is inductive. That is, I did not start with a hypothesis and test the data to evaluate it. Instead, I ran all the reasonable comparisons I could think of, and pulled out for discussion those that proved significant either at the 10% level (less than 10% chance that the two categories actually have identical distributions of values, that is, less than 10% chance that the difference is an illusion caused by the luck of the draw) or at the more convincing 5% level (less than 5% chance that the differences are an illusion caused by the luck
of the draw). This procedure is likely to produce some spurious “significant” results by chance. That is, out of one hundred tests of two identical distributions of values, five are expected to show differences “significant” at the 5% level, just by chance. For this reason, isolated significant results may or may not reflect real cultural processes. Where multiple significant results seem to reflect a single underlying trend, then the trend can be considered real.

Finally, the lack of statistically significant differences between most of the categories does not mean that there necessarily are no differences between the categories. It simply means that any differences present are not great enough to be detected with confidence based on the given sample size and variability.

The statistics were run on SAS software, using SAS instructions in the programs BOTGEN1.SAS and BOTCALC1.SAS, bottle data from BOTFRAG.DBF, and context data from CYPCTX3.DBF. The program is a simple text file that can be viewed using any word processor, and the data files can be viewed directly by Excel or most database programs.

**RESULTS**

**OCCUPATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>wholei</th>
<th>holef</th>
<th>wholem</th>
<th>winei</th>
<th>winef</th>
<th>winem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P+ (wealthy professional)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (professional)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (skilled)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U (unskilled)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>foodsti</th>
<th>foodstf</th>
<th>foodstm</th>
<th>groomi</th>
<th>groomf</th>
<th>groomm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P+ (wealthy professional)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (professional)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (skilled)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U (unskilled)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures are percentages. Variables ending in I are “percentage of all items, whole or broken.” Variables ending in F are “percentage of fragments only” (except WholeF, which is whole bottles divided by fragments). Variables ending in M are “percentage of MNI.”
Comparisons:

All 4 categories together for nonrandomness

All pairs:
- Wealthy (P+) vs. all others (P,S,U)
- Wealthy (P+) vs. Middle (P,S)
- Middle (P,S) vs. Unskilled (U)
- Middle (P,S) vs. Extremes (U,P+)
- Upper (P+,P) vs. Lower (S, U)
- Any skill (P+,P,S) vs. Unskilled (U)

Significant Differences (comparisons that reached at least 10% significance):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Category:</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Which has more?</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Sig @ 5%</th>
<th>Sig @ 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled (U) vs. Skilled (S) wholei</td>
<td></td>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>0.0883</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled (U) vs. Skilled (S) wholef</td>
<td></td>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>0.0883</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled (U) vs. Skilled (S) wholem</td>
<td></td>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>0.0882</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled (U) vs. Middle (S,P) wholei</td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>0.0808</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled (U) vs. Middle (S,P) wholef</td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>0.0808</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled (U) vs. Middle (S,P) wholem</td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>0.0848</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled (U) vs. All others wholei</td>
<td></td>
<td>All others</td>
<td>0.0898</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled (U) vs. All others wholef</td>
<td></td>
<td>All others</td>
<td>0.0898</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled (U) vs. All others wholem</td>
<td></td>
<td>All others</td>
<td>0.0857</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremes (P+,U) vs. Middle (S,P) wholei</td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>0.0382</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremes (P+,U) vs. Middle (S,P) wholef</td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>0.0382</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled (U) vs. Professional (P) winei</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0.0650</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled (U) vs. Professional (P) winealci</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0.0996</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled (U) vs. Professional (P) winealcf</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0.0996</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled (U) vs. Professional (P) winealcm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0.0367</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper (P,P+) vs. Lower (S,U) winei</td>
<td></td>
<td>High (P,P+)</td>
<td>0.0943</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper (P,P+) vs. Lower (S,U) winef</td>
<td></td>
<td>High (P,P+)</td>
<td>0.0663</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper (P,P+) vs. Lower (S,U) winealci</td>
<td></td>
<td>High (P,P+)</td>
<td>0.0495</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper (P,P+) vs. Lower (S,U) winealcf</td>
<td></td>
<td>High (P,P+)</td>
<td>0.0374</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper (P,P+) vs. Lower (S,U) winealcm</td>
<td></td>
<td>High (P,P+)</td>
<td>0.0322</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (P) vs. Skilled (S) winealcf</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0.0812</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled (U) vs. All others winem</td>
<td></td>
<td>All others</td>
<td>0.0868</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unskilled workers left a significantly smaller proportion of whole bottles in their refuse than did skilled workers, skilled workers and professionals combined, and all others combined—in every case significant for all three measures of whole bottles. None of the other categories differed significantly from each other in proportions of whole bottles. A likely interpretation is that unskilled workers recycled their whole bottles at a higher rate than did people with better-paying professions, presumably taking advantage of a small source of income that did not interest the others.

In the percentage data, the proportion of whole bottles in wealthy professional features is similar to those of the professional and skilled features by the MNI measure. However, wealthy professional features differ sharply by the “percent of items” and “percent of fragments” measures, seeming to have even fewer whole bottles than unskilled worker’s features. In theory, the MNI measure is probably the most realistic of the three, and it agrees with the general pattern in the other results. Nevertheless, it might be worth pursuing why the other two measures behave so differently from MNI in this case. One possible explanation is that the deposition process in the wealthy professional households somehow led to greater breaking up of glass fragments, which would make the whole bottles seem fewer by comparison.

The percentage data suggest a consistent gradation of wine bottles by profession, with the fewest in unskilled workers’ refuse, and increasing proportions in skilled, then professional, then wealthy professional households. The significance tests support this pattern, especially by the measures of wine bottles as a percentage of all alcohol bottles. Wine was clearly consumed more by those with higher-paying professions, at least for consumption at home.

Two significant comparisons suggest the reverse of this pattern in wine consumption. Beer and/or ale bottles were a greater fraction of the alcoholic beverage, bottle refuse at households of skilled workers than at wealthy professional households, albeit only by the weak “percentage of items” measure. Liquor bottles were a greater fraction of the alcoholic-beverage-bottle refuse at the lower income tier of unskilled and skilled workers, compared to the upper income tier of professionals and wealthy professionals, this time by the robust MNI measure. These patterns are easily interpretable and fit with preconceptions. While they are only weakly supported by these two barely significant statistics, there is little reason to doubt the reality of the patterns.

While one comparison involving food-storage bottles by MNI is significant at the 5% level, the percentage data do not suggest a clear pattern, and the other measures, while showing the same general pattern, do not produce any significant contrasts. This result is difficult to make
sense of, and without any other corroboration or plausible interpretation, it can probably be rejected as one of the expected occasional spurious significant results.

Finally, there is a weak suggestion in both the percentage data and one significant comparison by MNI that the lower two occupation categories have a higher proportion of grooming and health bottles than the upper two occupation categories. While this pattern is not strongly supported by the statistics, it could make sense. The “grooming and health” category is very broad, which could tend to obscure a stronger pattern in, for example, medicinal bottles, different types of medicinals, perfumes, or hair products. It would be worthwhile to analyze subsets of the grooming and health category.

**ETHNICITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity (all known)</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>wholei</th>
<th>wholef</th>
<th>wholem</th>
<th>liquori</th>
<th>liquorf</th>
<th>liquorm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/U.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German/English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prussian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scots/Irish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.-born</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity (all known)</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>foodsti</th>
<th>foodstf</th>
<th>foodstm</th>
<th>groomi</th>
<th>groomf</th>
<th>groomm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/U.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German/English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (all known)</td>
<td>Number of Features</td>
<td>foodsti</td>
<td>foodstf</td>
<td>foodstm</td>
<td>groomi</td>
<td>groomf</td>
<td>groomm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prussian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scots/Irish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.-born</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity (all known)</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>writingi</th>
<th>writingf</th>
<th>writingm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/U.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German/English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prussian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scots/Irish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.-born</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures are percentages. Variables ending in I are “percentage of all items, whole or broken.” Variables ending in F are “percentage of fragments only” (except WholeF, which is whole bottles divided by fragments). Variables ending in M are “percentage of MNI.”

**Comparisons:**

- All 4 common ethnicities together for nonrandomness
- All pairs of the 4 common ethnicities
- Each of the 4 common ethnicities vs. all the others lumped together, including less common ones
- White from former British Empire (Canada, English/U.S., Irish, Scots, Scots/Irish, U.S.-born) vs. white from continental Europe (German, Prussian, Italian)
### Significant Differences (Comparisons that reached at least 10% significance):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Which has more?</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Sig @ 5%</th>
<th>Sig @ 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irish vs. U.S.-born</td>
<td>liquor</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>0.0830</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish vs. U.S.-born</td>
<td>liquorf</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>0.0529</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish vs. U.S.-born</td>
<td>liqalc</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>0.0558</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish vs. U.S.-born</td>
<td>liqalcf</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>0.0347</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish vs. non-Irish</td>
<td>liquorf</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>0.0845</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish vs. non-Irish</td>
<td>liqalc</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>0.0883</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish vs. non-Irish</td>
<td>liqalcf</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>0.0678</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US vs. non-U.S.-born</td>
<td>liquorf</td>
<td>NonU.S.</td>
<td>0.0865</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US vs. non-U.S.-born</td>
<td>liqalcf</td>
<td>NonU.S.</td>
<td>0.0723</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German vs. all non-German</td>
<td>foodsti</td>
<td>All non-German</td>
<td>0.0953</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German vs. U.S.-born</td>
<td>foodsti</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>0.0580</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German vs. U.S.-born</td>
<td>foodstf</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>0.0811</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All major ethnicities</td>
<td>groomi</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.0823</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All major ethnicities</td>
<td>groomf</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.0514</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German vs. U.S.-born</td>
<td>groomi</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>0.0157</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German vs. U.S.-born</td>
<td>groomf</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>0.0087</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German vs. African American</td>
<td>groomi</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>0.0745</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German vs. African American</td>
<td>groomf</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>0.0745</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German vs. Irish</td>
<td>groomi</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>0.0756</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German vs. Irish</td>
<td>groomf</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>0.0509</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German vs. all non-German</td>
<td>groomi</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>0.0091</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German vs. all non-German</td>
<td>groomf</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>0.0059</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US vs. all non-U.S.-born</td>
<td>groomi</td>
<td>All non-U.</td>
<td>.0778</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British white vs. non-British white</td>
<td>groomi</td>
<td>non-British white</td>
<td>0.0383</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British white vs. non-British white</td>
<td>groomf</td>
<td>non-British white</td>
<td>0.0228</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German vs. U.S.-born</td>
<td>writingf</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>0.0925</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German vs. African American</td>
<td>writingi</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0.0502</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German vs. all non-German</td>
<td>writingf</td>
<td>All non-German</td>
<td>0.0578</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interpretations:

In general, the patterns by ethnicity are less convincing than many others, because none of them are significant using the conservative MNI measure. Many, however, are significant for both the “percentage of items” and “percentage of fragments” measures. This could be due to
the patterns being real but too weak to show up using the less-sensitive MNI measure, to
differential breakage by ethnicity, or to the patterns being statistical flukes without cultural
meaning.

With that caveat, there is a weak pattern of Irish features having a higher proportion of
liquor bottles than U.S. features and, even more weakly, than features of all other ethnicities
combined. This pattern is significant both when liquor bottles are considered as a fraction of all
the bottle glass, and when they are considered as a fraction of just alcoholic-beverage bottles.

Also statistically weak, but interestingly consistent, is the tendency of German features to
differ from the others. Specifically, German features may have more food storage bottles than
do U.S. features, and even more weakly, than do all non-German features combined. Continuing the trend, German features have more grooming/health bottles than do U.S.-born,
Irish, and African American features, and than all non-German features combined. All of these
patterns in grooming/health bottles are significant by both the “percentage of items” and the
“percentage of fragments” measures. Even though none of these patterns is significant by
“percentage of MNI,” their consistency does suggest that the German glass refuse was either
different to begin with, or experienced different depositional processes than most others. It
would be useful to subdivide the broad grooming/health category, since this and other patterns
might be clearer if the categories were limited to medicinal products only, cosmetic products
only, or even more specific kinds of bottles and associated activities. In other cases, this might
bring out additional significant patterns that cannot be detected with the broad
grooming/health category.

Non-U.S.-born features appear to have more grooming/health bottles than do U.S.-born
features, by just one of the three measures. Non-British Empire white features similarly have
more grooming/health bottles than do formerly British Empire white features, by both non-MNI
measures. Both of these patterns are probably due primarily to the many German features in the
non-U.S.-born and non-British Empire categories.

Finally, the German features also differ weakly, but in several different contrasts, from
others in having fewer writing-ink bottles.

There was no significant patterning in recycling (whole bottles) by ethnicity.
## Dwelling Type

By detailed dwelling categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Type</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>wholei</th>
<th>wholef</th>
<th>whom</th>
<th>liquori</th>
<th>liquorf</th>
<th>liquorm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P (Polite Victorian)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (Almost-polite)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (Simple, 2-story)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (Duplex)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (Informal workers’ cottage)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/C (Residence over shop)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H (Hotel)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Butcher shop)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA (Unknown)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Type</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>alcoholi</th>
<th>alcoholf</th>
<th>alcoholm</th>
<th>foodi</th>
<th>foodf</th>
<th>foodm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P (Polite Victorian)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (Almost-polite)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (Simple, 2-story)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (Duplex)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (Informal workers’ cottage)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/C (Residence over shop)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H (Hotel)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Butcher shop)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA (Unknown)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Type</td>
<td>Number of Features</td>
<td>writing</td>
<td>writingf</td>
<td>writingm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (Polite Victorian)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (Almost-polite)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (Simple, 2-story)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (Duplex)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (Informal workers’ cottage)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/C (Residence over shop)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H (Hotel)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Butcher shop)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA (Unknown)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By lumped dwelling categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Type</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>wholei</th>
<th>wholef</th>
<th>wholem</th>
<th>liquori</th>
<th>liquorf</th>
<th>liquorm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NonVict (I,D,S,A)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vict (P)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice (P,A)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple (I,D,S)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage (I)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House (P,A,S,D)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling (P,A,S,D,I)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Type</td>
<td>Number of Features</td>
<td>alcoholI</td>
<td>alcoholF</td>
<td>alcoholM</td>
<td>foodI</td>
<td>foodF</td>
<td>foodM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NonVict (I,D,S,A)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vict (P)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice (P,A)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple (I,D,S)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage (I)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House (P,A,S,D)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling (P,A,S,D,I)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Type</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>writingI</th>
<th>writingF</th>
<th>writingM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NonVict (I,D,S,A)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vict (P)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice (P,A)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple (I,D,S)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage (I)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House (P,A,S,D)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling (P,A,S,D,I)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures are percentages. Variables ending in I are “percentage of all items, whole or broken.” Variables ending in F are “percentage of fragments only” (except WholeF, which is whole bottles divided by fragments). Variables ending in M are “percentage of MNI.”
Comparisons:

All 9 categories together for nonrandomness, various subsets excluding nonresidential, all commercial, etc.

All pairs:

- Polite Victorian (P) vs. other homes (A,S,D,I)
- Nice homes (P,A) vs. simple homes (S,D,I)
- Cottages (I) vs. other homes (P,A,S,D)
- Hotel vs. other dwellings except Butcher shop and Residence over shop

Significant Differences (Comparisons that reached at least 10% significance):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling types:</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Which has more?</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Sig @ 5%</th>
<th>Sig @ 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All noncommercial dwelling types</td>
<td>liquorm</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.0918</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite Vict (P) v. Almost-polite (A)</td>
<td>liquori</td>
<td>Almost-polite</td>
<td>0.0699</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite Vict (P) v. Almost-polite (A)</td>
<td>liquorf</td>
<td>Almost-polite</td>
<td>0.0699</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite Vict (P) v. Almost-polite (A)</td>
<td>liquorm</td>
<td>Almost-polite</td>
<td>0.0699</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite Vict (P) v. Almost-polite (A)</td>
<td>liqalci</td>
<td>Almost-polite</td>
<td>0.0897</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite Vict (P) v. Almost-polite (A)</td>
<td>liqalcf</td>
<td>Almost-polite</td>
<td>0.0897</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite Vict (P) v. Almost-polite (A)</td>
<td>liqalcm</td>
<td>Almost-polite</td>
<td>0.0897</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite Vict (P) v. Duplex (D)</td>
<td>liquori</td>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>0.0104</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite Vict (P) v. Duplex (D)</td>
<td>liquorf</td>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>0.0502</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite Vict (P) v. Duplex (D)</td>
<td>liquorm</td>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>0.0104</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite Vict (P) v. Duplex (D)</td>
<td>liqalci</td>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>0.0162</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite Vict (P) v. Duplex (D)</td>
<td>liqalcf</td>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>0.0685</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite Vict (P) v. Duplex (D)</td>
<td>liqalcm</td>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>0.0162</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite Vict (P) v. Hotel (H)</td>
<td>liquori</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>0.0502</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite Vict (P) v. Hotel (H)</td>
<td>liquorf</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>0.0502</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite Vict (P) v. Hotel (H)</td>
<td>liquorm</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>0.0502</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite Vict (P) v. Hotel (H)</td>
<td>liqalci</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>0.0685</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite Vict (P) v. Hotel (H)</td>
<td>liqalcf</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>0.0685</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite Vict (P) v. Hotel (H)</td>
<td>liqalcm</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>0.0685</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite Vict (P) v. Inf. cottage (I)</td>
<td>liquori</td>
<td>Inf. cottage</td>
<td>0.0702</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite Vict (P) v. Inf. cottage (I)</td>
<td>liquorf</td>
<td>Inf. cottage</td>
<td>0.0835</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite Vict (P) v. Inf. cottage (I)</td>
<td>liquorm</td>
<td>Inf. cottage</td>
<td>0.0702</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite Vict (P) v. Inf. cottage (I)</td>
<td>liqalci</td>
<td>Inf. cottage</td>
<td>0.0856</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dwelling types: | Variable | Which has more? | Probability | Sig @ 5% | Sig @ 10% |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
Polite Vict (P) v. Inf. cottage (I) | liqalcm | Inf. cottage | 0.0856 | X | |
Polite Vict (P) v. NonVictorian | liquori | NonVictorian | 0.0568 | X | |
Polite Vict (P) v. NonVictorian | liquorf | NonVictorian | 0.0729 | X | |
Polite Vict (P) v. NonVictorian | liquorm | NonVictorian | 0.0568 | X | |
Polite Vict (P) v. NonVictorian | liqalci | NonVictorian | 0.0716 | X | |
Polite Vict (P) v. NonVictorian | liqalcf | NonVictorian | 0.0900 | X | |
Polite Vict (P) v. NonVictorian | liqalcm | NonVictorian | 0.0716 | X | |
Informal cottage (I) v. Duplex (D) | liqalcm | Duplex | 0.0619 | X | |
Informal cottage (I) v. Duplex (D) | liqalcm | Duplex | 0.0701 | X | |
Polite Vict (P) v. Duplex (D) | winealcf | Polite Vict. | 0.0700 | X | |
Polite Vict (P) v. Inf. cottage (I) | winealci | Polite Vict. | 0.0757 | X | |
Polite Vict (P) v. Inf. cottage (I) | winealcf | Polite Vict. | 0.0708 | X | |
Polite Vict (P) v. NonVictorian | winealci | Polite Vict. | 0.0665 | X | |
Polite Vict (P) v. NonVictorian | winealcf | Polite Vict. | 0.0600 | X | |
All noncommercial dwelling types | foodm | n/a | 0.0979 | X | |
Polite Vict (P) v. Hotel (H) | foodi | Hotel | 0.0725 | X | |
Simple 2-st (S) v. Polite Vict (P) | foodm | Simple 2-story | 0.0305 | X | X |
Simple 2-st (S) v. Almost-polite (A) | foodm | Simple 2-story | 0.0375 | X | X |
Simple 2-st (S) v. Inf. cottage (I) | foodm | Simple 2-story | 0.0288 | X | X |
Simple (S,D,I) v. Nice (P,A) | foodm | Simple (S,D,I) | 0.0610 | X | |
Informal cottage (I) v. Duplex (D) | writingi | Duplex | 0.0829 | X | |
Informal cottage (I) v. Duplex (D) | writingm | Duplex | 0.0764 | X | |
Polite Vict (P) v. Inf. cottage (I) | wholem | Polite Vict | 0.0947 | X | |

**Interpretations:**

While dwelling type was a strong predictor of meat consumption behavior, its correlation to bottle-glass assemblages was surprisingly spotty.

Features from Polite Victorian homes contained no liquor bottles, whole or broken. This does not appear to be a fluke, since it differed significantly and consistently from features from Almost-polite homes, Duplexes, Informal cottages, all private residences combined, and hotels, in each case by all three measures, whether considering liquor bottles as a fraction of all bottles or as a fraction of alcoholic beverage bottles only. The absence of liquor bottles at Polite Victorian homes presumably reflects practices at these homes that might include avoidance of hard liquor, consumption of hard liquor only outside the home, or different practices of disposal of liquor bottles.
Interestingly, there was no significant patterning of alcohol bottles in general (shown in the percentage tables despite the lack of significant patterns), nor in wine/champagne bottles or ale/beer bottles. The salient issue for the inhabitants of the Polite Victorian houses seems not to have been alcohol in general, but hard liquor specifically. Residents of Polite Victorian homes certainly did consume alcohol, and of the alcoholic beverage bottles in their refuse, the proportion of wine bottles was significantly greater than at duplexes, workers’ cottages, and non-Polite houses in general. This greater predominance of wine bottles at the finest houses clearly parallels the greater predominance of wine bottles at homes of people with higher-paying jobs.

No liquor bottles were recovered from features at Simple two-story houses, either, but with only three features representing this category, the pattern was not significant. Liquor bottles generally do not constitute more than a small percentage of a feature’s glass assemblage, so occasional complete absences could be due to chance. They could also reflect real patterns that the sample is simply too small to prove.

Among the other types of dwellings, only one combination differed in liquor bottles in the glass refuse. Duplexes had significantly more liquor bottles than did Informal workers’ cottages, by MNI only. Without any analogous significant differences to support it, this pattern is both poorly supported and difficult to interpret.

Simple two-story houses differed significantly from Polite Victorians, Almost-polite houses, and Informal workers’ cottages in having a higher percentage of food bottles in their glass refuse, according to the conservative MNI measure. Although the same pattern occurs in lumping Simple two-story houses with Duplexes and Informal cottages versus the two more high-status dwelling types, the percentage data do not suggest a gradation of food bottles by dwelling quality. Instead, there was probably something idiosyncratic about some or all of the households in the three Simple two-story homes that made them differ from the others in purchasing more bottled food.

Features from the four Duplexes tended to have significantly higher proportions of writing-ink bottles than did features from Informal workers’ cottages. Again, neither the percentage data, nor the comparisons of other dwelling types that produced no other significant patterns, suggest a gradation by quality of dwelling. Instead, duplexes are another category represented by a small number of features (just four), and their unusually high percentages of writing inkbottles probably have to do with peculiarities of some of those few households, rather than a larger, systemic pattern.

The households in the Simple two-story houses and in the Duplexes might reward closer scrutiny to determine why they differed from the others in food bottles and writing-ink bottles, respectively.

The percentage data suggest that hotels had relatively high percentages of whole bottles in their refuse, that is, that they did not recycle as much as did residential households, and that hotels had relatively higher proportions of hard liquor bottles in their refuse. While both of these patterns make sense, they did not rise to statistical significance, possibly due either to variation between hotels or the small sample size. Further work might clarify the standing of hotels here. Since hotels differed considerably from private households in their meat refuse, it is
reasonable to suspect that there could be comparable patterns in the glass that have yet to be recognized.

Finally, there is a weak pattern in the most reliable index of recycling (percentage of MNI), suggesting that there were more whole bottles in the refuse at Polite Victorian homes than at Informal workers’ cottages. The percentage data for all three measures tends to support the impression that residents of the Polite Victorians discarded somewhat more whole bottles than did other households, that is, that they recycled less. While this is an interesting corroboration of the general pattern in recycling by occupation, it also differs. Dividing households by profession, it appears that the one, lowest-paid sector recycled more than all the others, which did not differ much. Dividing households by dwelling type, it appears that the one, best-off sector recycled less than all the others, which did not differ much. Both patterns follow general economic expectations, but they differ in finding either a small, poor segment of the population doing more recycling than the rest, or a small, wealthy segment doing less recycling than the rest. Whether this difference means anything important is not clear.

**Tenancy**

By detailed tenancy categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Type</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>wholei</th>
<th>wholef</th>
<th>wholm</th>
<th>alcoholi</th>
<th>alcoholf</th>
<th>alcoholm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O       (Owner)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/T    (Owner/tenant)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T       (Tenant)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U       (Unknown/transient)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Type</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>liquori</th>
<th>liquorf</th>
<th>liquorm</th>
<th>winei</th>
<th>winef</th>
<th>winem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O       (Owner)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/T    (Owner/tenant)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T       (Tenant)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U       (Unknown/transient)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Type</td>
<td>Number of Features</td>
<td>beeri</td>
<td>beerf</td>
<td>beerm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O (Owner)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/T (Owner/tenant)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T (Tenant)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U (Unknown/transient)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By lumped tenure categories, still excluding commercial properties and residence over shop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure, Polite Vict. only</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>wholei</th>
<th>wholef</th>
<th>wholem</th>
<th>alcoholi</th>
<th>alcoholf</th>
<th>alcoholm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonowner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure, Almost-polite only</th>
<th>Number of features</th>
<th>wholei</th>
<th>wholef</th>
<th>wholem</th>
<th>alcoholi</th>
<th>alcoholf</th>
<th>alcoholm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NonOwner</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure, Cottages only</th>
<th>Number of features</th>
<th>wholei</th>
<th>wholef</th>
<th>wholem</th>
<th>alcoholi</th>
<th>alcoholf</th>
<th>Alcoholm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonowner</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure, Polite Vict. only</td>
<td>Number of features</td>
<td>liquori</td>
<td>liquorf</td>
<td>liquorm</td>
<td>winei</td>
<td>winef</td>
<td>winem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NonOwner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure, Almost-polite only</th>
<th>Number of features</th>
<th>liquori</th>
<th>liquorf</th>
<th>liquorm</th>
<th>winei</th>
<th>winef</th>
<th>winem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NonOwner</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure, Cottages only</th>
<th>Number of features</th>
<th>liquori</th>
<th>liquorf</th>
<th>liquorm</th>
<th>winei</th>
<th>winef</th>
<th>Winem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonowner</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure, Polite Vict. only</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>beeri</th>
<th>beerf</th>
<th>beerm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NonOwner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure, Almost-polite only</th>
<th>Number of features</th>
<th>beeri</th>
<th>beerf</th>
<th>beerm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NonOwner</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tenure, cottages only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure, cottages only</th>
<th>Number of features</th>
<th>beeri</th>
<th>beef</th>
<th>Beerm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NonOwner</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All tenure categories exclude commercial properties and residence over shop.

### Comparisons:

All 4 categories together for nonrandomness

All pairs:

Owner (O) vs. Renter (T,U)

Owner (O) vs. Renter (T,U) within just a single dwelling type: Polite Victorian, Almost-polite house, or Informal workers’ cottage

### Significant Differences (Comparisons that reached at least 10% significance):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Status</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Which has more?</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Sig @ 5%</th>
<th>Sig @ 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner (O) vs. Tenant (T)</td>
<td>alcoholi</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0549</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner (O) vs. Tenant (T)</td>
<td>alcoholf</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0475</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant (T) vs. Unknown (U)</td>
<td>alcoholi</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.0611</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant (T) vs. Unknown (U)</td>
<td>alcoholf</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.0963</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner vs. Nonowner, cottages only</td>
<td>alcoholi</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0597</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner vs. Nonowner, cottages only</td>
<td>alcoholf</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0769</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner vs. Nonowner, cottages only</td>
<td>liquorf</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0778</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All tenures</td>
<td>winei</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.0938</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All tenures</td>
<td>winef</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.0707</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner (O) vs. Tenant (T)</td>
<td>winei</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0151</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner (O) vs. Tenant (T)</td>
<td>winef</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0103</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner (O) vs. Tenant (T)</td>
<td>winem</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0920</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner (O) vs. Tenant (T)</td>
<td>winealci</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0342</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner (O) vs. Tenant (T)</td>
<td>winealf</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0249</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner (O) vs. Tenant (T)</td>
<td>winealcj</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0536</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner (O) vs. Nonowner (T,U)</td>
<td>winei</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0275</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Status</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Which has more?</td>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>Sig @ 5%</td>
<td>Sig @ 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner (O) vs. Nonowner (T,U)</td>
<td>winef</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0165</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner (O) vs. Nonowner (T,U)</td>
<td>winealci</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0337</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner (O) vs. Nonowner (T,U)</td>
<td>winealcf</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0221</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner (O) vs. Nonowner (T,U)</td>
<td>winealc</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0545</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner vs. Nonowner, cottages only</td>
<td>winei</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0677</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner vs. Nonowner, cottages only</td>
<td>winef</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0618</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner vs. Nonowner, almost-polite only</td>
<td>winealci</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0720</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner vs. Nonowner, almost-polite only</td>
<td>winealcf</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0720</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner vs. Nonowner, almost-polite only</td>
<td>winealc</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0.0347</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner (O) vs. Tenant (T)</td>
<td>beeralci</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>0.0714</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner (O) vs. Tenant (T)</td>
<td>beeralc</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>0.0774</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant (T) vs. Unknown (U)</td>
<td>beeralci</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>0.0769</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant (T) vs. Unknown (U)</td>
<td>beeralc</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>0.0353</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All tenure comparisons exclude commercial properties and residence over shop.

**Interpretations:**

The patterning based on ownership versus renting was almost entirely restricted to the more sensitive, but less convincing, “percentage of items” and “percentage of fragments” measures in comparisons to the entire assemblage of bottle glass. Many of the same patterns, however, proved significant by all three measures when considering proportions of bottles among only the alcoholic-beverage bottles. This means that the differences in overall consumption of alcoholic beverages are only weakly supported, but that the differences in preferences within alcoholic beverages are well-supported.

That said, both the percentage data and the significance tests suggest that households that owned their homes disposed of more bottles of alcoholic beverages in general than did tenants. This tendency persists when the analysis is limited to just those living in Informal workers’ cottages and tenants are lumped with unknown-tenure, presumably short-term residents. In this case, owners of cottages also may have discarded more liquor bottles than nonowners of cottages, although this is suggested by only one of the three measures.

Owners also disposed of more wine bottles than did tenants alone, tenants lumped with unknown-tenure residents in all dwellings, and tenants lumped with unknown-tenure residents in cottages only. The contrast in wine bottles between owners and tenants is the one comparison that is significant by all three measures in terms of the entire assemblage. Just as wine bottles were associated with higher-paid jobs and nicer houses, they also seem to be associated with
homeownership, that is, with capital wealth. Wine bottles appear to be an excellent index of what would generally be recognized as upper-class status.

Once again, the reverse pattern in wine is supported, albeit not as broadly. Beer and/or ale bottles formed a larger proportion of alcoholic-everage bottles discarded by tenants than by owners, both by percentage of items and by percentage of MNI.

The consistent pattern here is that owners discarded more bottles of alcoholic beverages in general, of wine in particular, and at least among Cottage dwellers, of liquor, than did non-owners. This is a surprising contrast to their meat consumption, which generally did not differ significantly by ownership, with one exception in which the renters appeared to eat better meat than the owners. In the meat analysis, I suggested that renters may have had more disposable income, or conversely, that owners may have had greater expenses. It is tempting to suggest that the owners' greater consumption of alcohol in general, wine, and possibly liquor could be related to those same stresses, although that would be pure speculation.

The unknown-tenancy households also had significantly higher proportions of alcohol bottles than did the tenant households. They also had lower proportions of beer and/or ale bottles. If many of these households were, in fact, short-term, transient occupants, then it seems that these least-stable households were consuming more alcohol, and of that, a lower percentage of the least intoxicating variety. Returning to the notion that alcohol consumption parallels stress, maybe this suggests that longer-term renters had less stressful lives than did either more transient households or home-owning households. Certainly these patterns could be explained in other ways, as well.

There was no clear or significant patterning in recycling (whole bottles) by tenancy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>wholei</th>
<th>wholef</th>
<th>wholem</th>
<th>foodi</th>
<th>foodf</th>
<th>foodm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East of Market</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Point</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Market</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Neighborhood | Number of Features | foodsti | foodstf | foodstm | writingi | writingf | writingm |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
East of Market | 26 | 6.8 | 7.0 | 3.7 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 2.2 |
Oakland Point | 31 | 12.7 | 13.4 | 5.5 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 1.6 |
West of Market | 21 | 8.5 | 9.1 | 3.5 | 2.4 | 1.5 | 3.2 |
Total: | 78 | 9.6 | 10.1 | 4.4 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 2.2 |

All neighborhood categories include only noncommercial properties.

**Comparisons:**

All 3 categories together for non-randomness

All pairs

**Significant Differences (comparisons that reached at least 10% significance):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhoods</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Which has more?</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Sig @ 5%</th>
<th>Sig @ 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All neighborhoods</td>
<td>wholei</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.0903</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All neighborhoods</td>
<td>wholef</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.0903</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All neighborhoods</td>
<td>wholem</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.0302</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Market v. East of Market</td>
<td>wholei</td>
<td>West of Market</td>
<td>0.0323</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Market v. East of Market</td>
<td>wholef</td>
<td>West of Market</td>
<td>0.0323</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Market v. East of Market</td>
<td>wholem</td>
<td>West of Market</td>
<td>0.0109</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Market v. Oakland Point</td>
<td>wholem</td>
<td>West of Market</td>
<td>0.0734</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All neighborhoods</td>
<td>foodm</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.0165</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Point v. East of Market</td>
<td>foodm</td>
<td>Oakland Point</td>
<td>0.0270</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Point v. West of Market</td>
<td>foodm</td>
<td>Oakland Point</td>
<td>0.0115</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All neighborhoods</td>
<td>foodstm</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.0839</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Point v. East of Market</td>
<td>foodstl</td>
<td>Oakland Point</td>
<td>0.0384</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Point v. East of Market</td>
<td>foodstf</td>
<td>Oakland Point</td>
<td>0.0470</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Point v. East of Market</td>
<td>foodstm</td>
<td>Oakland Point</td>
<td>0.0630</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Point v. West of Market</td>
<td>foodstm</td>
<td>Oakland Point</td>
<td>0.0643</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All neighborhoods</td>
<td>winealci</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.0436</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All neighborhoods</td>
<td>winealcf</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.0356</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Point v. East of Market</td>
<td>winealci</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.0257</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Point v. East of Market</td>
<td>winealcf</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.0161</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Neighborhoods | Variable | Which has more? | Probability | Sig @ 5% | Sig @ 10%  
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---  
Oakland Point v. East of Market | winealcm | E | 0.0992 | X |  
Oakland Point v. West of Market | winealci | W | 0.0553 | X |  
Oakland Point v. West of Market | winealcf | W | 0.0714 | X |  
Oakland Point v. East of Market | beeralcf | E | 0.0907 | X |  
Oakland Point v. West of Market | writingi | West of Market | 0.0940 | X |  

All neighborhood comparisons include only noncommercial properties.

**Interpretations:**

Recycling activity, as measured by the proportion of whole bottles in each feature assemblage, was strongly patterned by neighborhood. The West of Market neighborhood had a higher proportion of bottles, and therefore presumably less recycling, than did the East of Market neighborhood at 5% confidence on all three measures. West of Market features also suggest less recycling than do Oakland Point features, although only at the 10% confidence level and only by the most conservative MNI measure. Maybe selling recycled bottles was less convenient for West of Market residents due to a relative scarcity of buyers in the neighborhood, or the need to carry bottles farther to sell them.

The economic or ethnic composition of the West of Market neighborhood might be expected to explain this difference. However, West of Market had a distribution of occupations roughly similar to East of Market; it is the Oakland Point neighborhood that clearly differs on this score. In fact, the least recycling occurs in the West of Market neighborhood, in spite of the fact that it has an intermediate proportion of unskilled workers’ households (which tend to recycle more), so the distribution of professions in the neighborhoods cannot account for the lower recycling West of Market. On the other hand, six of the eight Polite Victorian houses are in the West of Market neighborhood, and the analysis by dwelling type indicates that residents of these houses recycled less than those of other dwelling types. It is possible that the low rate of recycling West of Market reflects practices of residents of the finest houses, rather than neighborhood factors.

The Oakland Point neighborhood, with the highest proportion of unskilled and skilled workers, the lowest proportion of professionals, and no wealthy professionals, differed strongly from the other two neighborhoods in several aspects of its bottle-glass refuse. Oakland Point households had more food bottles than either of the other two neighborhoods by the conservative MNI measure at a confidence level of 5%. Similarly, features from the Oakland Point neighborhood had higher proportions of food-storage bottles than those from East of Market by all three measures, and than those from West of Market by the MNI measure. The emphasis in Oakland Point on food purchased in glass containers seems paradoxical in light of the residents’ generally lower-paid jobs. Maybe it relates to more convenient access to stores that carried such items. This neighborhood’s relative preference for home preservation of foods in glass seems sensible both as a labor-intensive but cost-saving measure if the food-storage bottles were purchased empty for home use, and also as a possible response to an informal or local trade in foods preserved in nearby household production, as opposed to factory products.
The Oakland Point neighborhood also differed strongly from the other two in having significantly lower proportions of wine bottles among the alcoholic beverage bottles than did both other neighborhoods. This pattern was significant by the less-convincing “percentage of items” and “percentage of fragments” measures in the case of the West of Market neighborhood, with its intermediate mix of profession categories. The pattern was stronger in comparison to the East of Market neighborhood, where all the wealthy professionals and relatively fewer skilled and unskilled workers lived. Wine bottles were a significantly higher proportion of alcoholic beverage bottles in the East of Market neighborhood by all three measures, two of which were significant at well below the 5% level. Since wine bottles are strongly associated with higher-paying jobs, the low proportion of wine bottles in Oakland Point probably reflects the low proportion of residents there with higher-paying jobs.

Finally, features from West of Market had a higher percentage of writing-ink bottles than those from Oakland Point, by the “percentage of items” measure only, and just barely squeaking under the 10% confidence cutoff. Without corroboration from other measures or an obvious interpretation, this pattern can probably be ignored.

### GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All noncommercial</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>wholei</th>
<th>wholef</th>
<th>wholem</th>
<th>winei</th>
<th>winef</th>
<th>winem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not woman-headed household</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman-headed household</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cottages Only</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
<th>wholei</th>
<th>wholef</th>
<th>wholem</th>
<th>winei</th>
<th>winef</th>
<th>winem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not woman-headed household</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman-headed household</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparisons:**
All pairs, both including all noncommercial properties and limited to cottages only
Significant Differences (Comparisons that reached at least 10% significance):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head of Household Gender</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Which has more?</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Sig @ 5%</th>
<th>Sig @ 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woman-headed vs. not (cottages only)</td>
<td>winei</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>0.0745</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman-headed vs. not (cottages only)</td>
<td>winef</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>0.0889</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretations:

The percentage data suggest that households headed by women might have left a lower proportion of whole bottles in their refuse, indicating more recycling, especially when the comparison is limited only to Informal workers’ cottages. However, this pattern is not significant by any of the three measures. It should be considered a plausible hint rather than a demonstrated pattern.

Households headed by women may have had a higher proportion of wine bottles in their glass refuse, although this pattern appears only in the two less-conservative measures of “percentage of items” and “percentage of fragments.” This could be because this tendency of woman-headed households was real, but was not a great enough difference to be detected using the less-sensitive MNI measure. This relative preference for wine in women-headed worker households could be real, but should be regarded with caution.